

STUDY OF TRANSPORTATION GOALS, BENCHMARKS AND TEN-YEAR INVESTMENT CRITERIA AND PROCESS

appendices

SUBMITTED TO THE WASHINGTON STATE TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT BOARD (TPAB)

BY
LUND CONSULTING INC.
CEDAR RIVER GROUP
411 UNIVERSITY STREET, SUITE 1200
SEATTLE, WA 98101
(206) 442-4254
FEBRUARY 15, 2006

Study of Transportation Goals, Benchmarks and Ten-Year Investment Criteria and Process

Washington State Transportation Performance Audit Board February 2006

Appendices Table of Contents

| | Page |
|--|-------|
| Appendix A: 2005 Washington State Legislature Mandates to the | |
| Transportation Performance Audit Board | A-1 |
| Appendix B: GASB Criteria for Effective Communication of | |
| Performance Measures | A-2 |
| Appendix C: Federal Investment Criteria in Legislation and Regulations | A-4 |
| Appendix D: Selected State Law Related to Transportation Planning | A-6 |
| Appendix E: Selected Executive Orders | A-12 |
| Appendix F: Regional Transportation Investment Process | A-13 |
| Appendix G: Best Practices Review: Performance Measurement in Other States | A-41 |
| Appendix H: Draft Performance Measure Glossary | A-108 |
| Appendix I: Performance Measures – State of Washington and Other States | A-111 |

Appendix A

2005 Washington State Legislature Mandates to the Transportation Performance Audit Board

ESSB 6091 Section 206 subsection 2: ...the transportation performance audit board shall conduct a study and make recommendations to the legislature regarding the modification RCW 47.01.012, state transportation goals and benchmarks. In conducting the study, the board shall consider at a minimum: original recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on Transportation; the current policy goals and benchmark categories; the goals outlined in Substitute House Bill No. 1969; the recent work related to benchmarks completed by the transportation commission and the Washington state department of transportation; the measures review completed by TPAB; and best practices.

ESSB 5513 Section 16 subsection 2: The board shall, as soon as practicable, conduct a review of the comprehensive, ten-year investment program process, including the required criteria, under RCW 47.05.030 and 47.05.051.

ESSB 6103 Section 104 subsection 3: By January 1, 2006, the transportation performance audit board must develop performance measures and benchmarks for the evaluation of the expenditures of the transportation partnership account. The board must also develop an audit plan and schedule for audits of the performance of the department of transportation's delivery of the plan as defined by the project list, schedule and budget enacted by the legislature.

Appendix B

GASB Criteria for Effective Communication of Performance Measures

GASB recommended the following sixteen (16) criteria for effective communication of performance measures:

- 1. Purpose and scope: The purpose and scope of the report should be stated clearly and should include information about the completeness of the report in its coverage of key, major or critical programs and services.
- **2. Statement of major goals and objectives:** The report should clearly state the major goals and objectives of the organization and the source for those goals and objectives.
- **3. Involvement in establishing goals and objectives:** The report should include a discussion of the involvement of citizens, elected officials, management and employees in the process of establishing goals and objectives for the organization.
- **4. Multiple levels of reporting:** Performance information should be presented at different levels (layers) of reporting. The relationship between levels of available performance information should be clearly communicated and should include how the user can find information at the different levels reported.
- **5. Analysis results and challenges:** The report should include an executive or management analysis that objectively discusses the major results for the reporting period as well as the identified challenges facing the organization in achieving its mission, goals and objectives.
- **6. Focus on key measures:** The report should focus on key measures of performance that provide a basis for assessing the results for key, major or critical programs and services; and major goals and objectives of the organization. An external performance report should be concise, yet comprehensive in its coverage of performance.
- **7. Reliable information:** The report should contain information that readers can use to assess the reliability of reporting performance information.
- **8. Relevant measures of results:** Reporting performance measures should be relevant to what the organization has agreed to try to accomplish and where possible, should be linked to its mission, goals and objectives as set forth in a strategic plan, budget or other source.
- **9. Resources used and efficiency:** Reported performance information should include information about resources used or costs of programs and services. It also could report performance information relating cost to outputs or outcomes (efficiency measures).
- **10. Citizen and customer perceptions:** Citizen and customer perceptions of the quality and results of major and critical programs and services should be reported when appropriate.
- **11. Comparisons for assessing performance:** Reported performance information should include comparative information for assessing performance, such as to other periods, established targets or other internal and external sources.
- **12. Factors affecting results:** The report should include a discussion of identified external and internal factors that have had a significant effect on performance and will help provide a context for understanding the organization's performance.

- **13. Aggregation and desegregation of information:** Reporting performance information should be aggregated or disaggregated based on the needs and interests of intended users.
- **14. Consistency:** Reporting performance measures should be consistent from period to period; however, if performance measures or the measurement methodology used is significantly changed, that change and the reason(s) for that change should be noted.
- **15. Easy to find, access and understand:** The availability of an external report on performance and how to obtain that report should be widely communicated through channels appropriate for the organization and intended users. Performance information should be communicated through a variety of mediums and methods suitable to the intended user.
- **16. Regular and timely reporting:** Performance information should be reporting on a regular basis (usually annually). The reporting information should be made available as soon after the end of the reporting period as possible.

(*Governmental Accounting Standards Board*, Special Report: Reporting Performance Information: Suggested Criteria for Effective Communication, August 2003, pp. 36-39)

Appendix C

Federal Investment Criteria in Legislation and Regulations

Department of Transportation Act of 1966

Plans must be developed taking into account:

- Projected growth of transportation needs and traffic in the affected area;
- Relative efficiency of various modes of transportation;
- Available transportation services in the area; and
- General effect of the proposed investment on existing modes of transportation and on the regional and national economy.

U.S. Department of Transportation Strategic Plan 2003-2008, September 2003

- Enhance public health and safety by working toward the elimination of transportation-related deaths and injuries.
- Advance accessible, efficient, inter-modal transportation for the movement of people and goods.
- Facilitate a more efficient domestic and global transportation system that enables economic growth and development.
- Promote transportation solutions that enhance communities and protect the natural and built environment.
- Balance homeland and national security transportation requirements with the mobility needs of the nation for personal travel and commerce.
- Advance the Department's ability to manage for results and achieve the goals of the President's Management Agenda.

U.S. Government Accounting Office [GAO], Surface Transportation: GAO 04-744, June 2004

Key factors, as identified in federal requirements, include the following:

- Ensure compliance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, Clean Air Act, and Civil Rights Act;
- Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency;
- Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- Increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and for freight;
- Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve quality of life:
- Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
- Promote efficient system management and operation;
- Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system;
- Promote congestion relief and prevention through management strategies/systems;
- Consider the likely effect of transportation policies on land use and development;
- Consider using innovative mechanisms for financing projects;
- Expand, enhance and increase use of transit services;

- Examine the overall social, economic, energy and environmental effects of transportation decisions;
- Consider access to ports, airports and inter-modal transportation facilities;
- Preserve rights-of-way access for future transportation projects;
- Consider connectivity of roads in areas outside MPO planning boundaries and in other states;
- Consider recreational travel and tourism needs.

Executive Order 12893 (Principles for Federal Infrastructure Investments)

- Infrastructure investments must be based on systematic analysis of expected benefits and costs, including both quantitative and qualitative measures. All types of benefits and costs, both market and non-market, should be considered. Attempts must be given to quantifying environmental and other non-market benefits and costs.
- Benefits and costs should be measured and appropriately discounted over the full life cycle of each project.
- When the amount and timing of important benefits and costs are uncertain, analyses must recognize the uncertainty and address it through appropriate quantitative and qualitative assessments.
- Analyses must compare a comprehensive set of options including managing demand, repairing facilities, and expanding facilities.
- Analyses should consider not only quantifiable measures of benefits and costs, but also qualitative measures reflecting values that are not readily quantified.

Appendix D

Selected State Law Related to Transportation Planning

RCW 47.01.011: Plan Intent.

- Create a statewide transportation development plan
- Identify present status
- Set goals for the future
- Coordinate transportation modes
- Promote and protect land use programs required in local, state and federal law
- Coordinate transportation with the economic development of the state
- Supply a broad framework in which regional, metropolitan, and local transportation needs can be related
- Facilitate the supply of federal and state aid to those areas that will most benefit the state as a whole
- Provide for public involvement in the transportation planning and development process
- Administer programs within the jurisdiction of this title relating to the safety of the state's transportation systems
- Coordinate and implement national transportation policy with the state transportation planning program.

RCW 47.01.012: Benchmarks

- In addition to improving safety, public investments in transportation shall support achievement of these and other priority goals:
- No interstate highways, state routes, and local arterials shall be in poor condition
- No bridges shall be structurally deficient, and safety retrofits shall be performed on those state bridges at the highest seismic risk levels
- Traffic congestion on urban state highways shall be significantly reduced and be no worse than the national mean
- Delay per driver shall be significantly reduced and no worse than the national mean
- Per capita vehicle miles traveled shall be maintained at 2000 levels
- The non-auto share of commuter trips shall be increased in urban areas
- Administrative costs as a percentage of transportation spending shall achieve the most efficient quartile nationally
- The state's public transit agencies shall achieve the median cost per vehicle revenue hour of peer transit agencies, adjusting for the regional cost-of-living.

RCW 47.01.071: Commission — Functions, Powers, and Duties.

- Establish performance measures to ensure transportation system performance at local, regional, and state government levels
- Develop and maintain a comprehensive and balanced statewide transportation system that will meet the needs of the people of this state for safe and efficient transportation services
- Integrate intermodal transportation systems to implement the social, economic, and environmental policies, goals, and objectives of the people of the state, and especially to conserve nonrenewable natural resources including land and energy

- Develop transportation policies based on the policies, goals, and objectives expressed and inherent in existing state laws
- Inventory the adopted policies, goals, and objectives of the local and area-wide governmental bodies of the state and define the role of the state, regional, and local governments in determining transportation policies, in transportation planning, and in implementing the state transportation plan
- Provide for the effective coordination of state transportation planning with national transportation policy, state and local land use policies, and local and regional transportation plans and programs
- Integrate the statewide transportation plan with the needs of the elderly and handicapped
- Coordinate federal and state programs directed at assisting local governments to answer such needs
- Take into account federal law and regulations relating to the planning, construction, and operation of transportation facilities
- Use intelligent transportation systems and other technology-based solutions.

RCW 47.05.051: Ten-Year Comprehensive Investment Program — Priority Selection Criteria — Improvement Program Criteria — Departure From Criteria.

Priority programming for the preservation program shall take into account the following, not necessarily in order of importance:

Extend the service life of the existing highway system, including using the most cost-effective pavement surfaces, considering:

- Life-cycle cost analysis
- Traffic volume
- Subgrade soil conditions
- Environmental and weather conditions
- Materials available
- Construction factors
- Ensuring the structural ability to carry loads imposed upon highways and bridges
- Minimizing life cycle costs.

Priority programming for the improvement program must be based primarily upon the following, not necessarily in order of importance:

- Traffic congestion, delay, and accidents
- Location within a heavily traveled transportation corridor, except for projects in cities having a population of less than five thousand persons
- Synchronization with other potential transportation projects, including transit and multimodal projects, within the heavily traveled corridor
- Use of benefit/cost analysis wherever feasible to determine the value of the proposed project.

Priority programming for the improvement program may also take into account:

- Support for the state's economy, including job creation and job preservation
- The cost-effective movement of people and goods
- Accident and accident risk reduction
- Protection of the state's natural environment
- Continuity and systematic development of the highway transportation network
- Consistency with local comprehensive plans developed under chapter 36.70A RCW including the following if they have been included in the comprehensive plan:
 - o Support for development in and revitalization of existing downtowns
 - o Extent that development implements local comprehensive plans for rural and urban residential and nonresidential densities
 - o Extent of compact, transit-oriented development for rural and urban residential and nonresidential densities
 - o Opportunities for multimodal transportation
 - Extent to which the project accommodates planned growth and economic development
 - o Consistency with regional transportation plans developed under chapter 47.80 RCW
 - o Public views concerning proposed improvements
 - o The conservation of energy resources
 - o Feasibility of financing the full proposed improvement
 - o Commitments established in previous legislative sessions
 - o Relative costs and benefits of candidate programs.

Major projects addressing capacity deficiencies which prioritize allowing for preliminary engineering shall be reprioritized during the succeeding biennium, based upon updated project data. Reprioritized projects may be delayed or canceled by the transportation commission if higher priority projects are awaiting funding.

The commission shall identify those projects that yield freight mobility benefits or that alleviate the impacts of freight mobility upon affected communities.

Note on Intent [2002 c 5 § 405.]

"The legislature intends that funding for transportation mobility improvements be allocated to the worst traffic chokepoints in the state. Furthermore, the legislature intends to fund projects that provide systemic relief throughout a transportation corridor, rather than spot improvements that fail to improve overall mobility within a corridor."

RCW 47.06.030: Transportation Policy Plan

- Be consistent with the state's growth management goals
- Expedite the completion of industrial projects of statewide significance.

RCW 47.06.040: Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan

- Conform with federal requirements
- Ensure the continued mobility of people and goods within regions and across the state in a safe, cost-effective manner

- Include a state-owned facilities component, which shall guide state investment for state highways including bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and state ferries; and
- Include a state-interest component, which shall define the state interest in aviation, marine ports and navigation, freight rail, inter-city passenger rail, bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways, and public transportation
- Recommend actions in coordination with appropriate public and private transportation providers to ensure that the state interest in these transportation modes is met
- Be consistent with the state transportation policy plan and with each other
- Reflect public involvement
- Be consistent with regional transportation planning, high-capacity transportation planning, and local comprehensive plans prepared under chapter 36.70A RCW
- Include analysis of intermodal connections and choices
- A primary emphasis for these plans shall be:
 - o Relief of congestion
 - o Preservation of existing investments and downtowns
 - o Ability to attract or accommodate planned population
 - o Employment growth
 - o Improvement of traveler safety
 - o Efficient movement of freight and goods
 - o Improvement and integration of all transportation modes to create a seamless intermodal transportation system for people and goods.
- Identify and document potential affected environmental resources, including, but not limited to, wetlands, storm water runoff, flooding, air quality, fish passage, and wildlife habitat.

RCW 47.06.043: Technical Workers — Skill Enhancement

Plan for enhancing the skills of the existing technical transportation work force.

RCW 47.06.045: Freight Mobility Plan

Assess the transportation needs to ensure the safe, reliable, and efficient movement of goods within and through the state and to ensure the state's economic vitality.

RCW 47.06.050: State-Owned Facilities Component

- Establish structural preservation objectives for the state highway system including bridges
- Identify current and future structural deficiencies based upon analysis of current conditions and projected future deterioration
- Recommend program funding levels and specific actions necessary to preserve the structural integrity of the state highway system consistent with adopted objectives
- Use lowest life cycle cost methodologies in developing a pavement management system
- Establish service levels for highway maintenance on state-owned highways that meet benchmarks established by the transportation commission
- Estimate costs for achieving those service levels over twenty years
- Establish operational objectives, including safety considerations, for moving people and goods on the state highway system
- Identify current and future capacity, operational, and safety deficiencies, and recommend program funding levels and specific improvements and strategies necessary to achieve the operational objectives

- First assess strategies to enhance the operational efficiency of the existing system before recommending system expansion. Strategies to enhance the operational efficiencies include but are not limited to access management, transportation system management, demand management, and high-occupancy vehicle facilities
- Conform to the state implementation plan for air quality and be consistent with regional transportation plans adopted under chapter 47.80 RCW.
- Identify and recommend designation of scenic and recreational highways
- Provide for enhanced access to scenic, recreational, and cultural resources associated with designated routes
- Recommend a variety of management strategies to protect, preserve, and enhance these resources.
- Identify the needs of non-motorized transportation modes on the state transportation systems and provide the basis for the investment of state transportation funds in paths and trails, including funding provided under chapter 47.30 RCW.
- Establish service objectives for state ferry routes
- Forecast travel demand for the various markets served in the ferry system
- Develop strategies for ferry system investment that consider regional and statewide vehicle and passenger needs
- Support local land use plans
- Assure that ferry services are fully integrated with other transportation services
- Provide for maintenance of capital assets
- Provide for preservation of capital assets based on lowest life cycle cost methodologies. The
 plan shall assess the role of private ferries operating under the authority of the utilities and
 transportation commission
- Coordinate ferry system capital and operational plans with these private operations
- Be consistent with the regional transportation plans for areas served by the state ferry system
- Be developed in conjunction with the ferry advisory committees.

RCW 43.88.005: Budget Development Intent

- The legislature finds that agency missions, goals, and objectives should focus on statewide results
- It is the intent of the legislature to focus the biennial budget on how state agencies produce real results that reflect the goals of statutory programs
- Specifically, budget managers and the legislature must have the data to move toward better statewide results that produce the intended public benefit
- This data must be supplied in an impartial, quantifiable form, and demonstrate progress toward statewide results
- With a renewed focus on achieving true results, state agencies, the office of financial management, and the legislature will be able to prioritize state resources.

RCW 43.88.090: Development of Budget

- Each state agency shall define its mission and establish measurable goals for achieving
 desirable results. Each agency shall also develop clear strategies and timelines to achieve its
 goals.
- Each state agency shall establish quality and productivity objectives for each major activity in its budget. Objectives must be consistent with the agency's missions and goals.
- Objectives must be expressed to the extent practicable in outcome-based, objective, and measurable form.
- Objectives must specifically address the statutory purpose or intent of the program or activity
 and focus on data that measure whether the agency is achieving or making progress toward
 the purpose of the activity and toward statewide priorities.
- Each state agency shall adopt procedures for and perform continuous self-assessment of each activity, using the required mission, goals, objectives, and measurements. The assessment of the activity must also include an evaluation of major information technology systems or projects that may assist the agency in achieving or making progress toward the activity purpose and statewide priorities.
- Each agency's budget recommendations must be directly linked to the agency's stated mission and program, quality, and productivity goals and objectives. Agency budget proposals must include integration of performance measures that allow objective determination of an activity's success in achieving its goals.

Appendix E

Selected Executive Orders

Government Management Accountability and Performance (GMAP)

- Use strategies that work, and make corrections when they don't.
- Base decisions not on guesswork or preference but on accurate, up-to-date information.
- Make decisions timely.
- Follow up to make sure there's implementation after a decision has been made.
- Take risks and learn from mistakes.
- Communicate clearly to citizens about results.

GMAP will require each agency to:

- Develop clear, relevant and easy-to-understand measures that show whether or not programs are successful.
- Demonstrate how programs contribute to the priorities that are important to citizens.
- Gather, monitor, and analyze program data.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of programs.
- Hold regular problem-solving sessions within the agency to improve performance.
- Allocate resources based on strategies that work.
- Regularly report to the Governor on their performance.

The Governor will issue regular reports to the public that reflect the principles of GMAP. Each report will include a realistic assessment of government performance, including both successes and failures. These reports will be clear and easy to read, and they will focus on what is most important to citizens.

This executive order supersedes the reporting requirements specified in Executive Order 97-03.

Governor's Plain Talk Principles

- Clear language that is commonly used by the intended audience.
- Only the information needed by the recipient, presented in a logical sequence.
- Short sentences.
- Sentences, written in active voice, that make it clear who is responsible for what.
- Layout and design that help the reader understand the meaning on the first try.
- This includes adequate white space, bulleted lists, helpful headings and other proven techniques.

Appendix F

Regional Transportation Investment Process

The 1991 state Growth Management Act enabled counties to form regional transportation planning organizations (RTPO) (Ch. 47.80 RCW). Regional councils of government typically serve as the RTPO or metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for their region. RTPOs must: (1) encompass at least one complete county; (2) have a population of at least 100,000 or contain a minimum of three counties; and (3) have as members all counties within the region, and at least 60 percent of the cities and towns within the region, representing a minimum of 75 percent of the cities' and towns' population. (Municipal Research & Services Center of Washington, "National, Statewide and Regional Transportation Planning," Oct. 2005)

There are eleven (11) MPOs and fourteen (14) RTPOs in Washington:

- 1. Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (BFCOG) (Benton, Franklin, Walla Walla)
- 2. North Central (NCRTPO) (Chelan, Douglas, Okanogan) and Wenatchee Valley Transportation Council
- 3. Northeast Washington RTPO (TRICO) (Ferry, Pend Oreille, Stevens)
- 4. Palouse (Asotin, Columbia, Garfield, Whitman) Palouse Economic Development Council
- 5. Peninsula RTPO (Clallam, Jefferson, Kitsap, Mason)
- 6. Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) (King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish) Transportation Policy Board
- 7. QUAD County (Quadco) (Lincoln, Grant, Adams, Kittitas)
- 8. Skagit/Island RTPO Skagit County Council of Governments
- 9. Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council RTC (Clark, Klickitat, Skamania)
- 10. Southwest Washington RTPO (Cowlitz, Grays Harbor, Lewis, Pacific, Wahkiakum) Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments (CWCOG)
- 11. Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) (Spokane, Whitman)
- 12. Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC) Metropolitan and Regional Transportation Planning
- 13. Whatcom County Council of Governments (WCCOG) MPO and RTPO
- 14. Yakima Valley Conference of Governments (YVCOG)

The following sections detail the investment priorities in regional transportation plans.

1. Benton-Franklin Council of Governments

Overview

The Regional Transportation Plan for the Tri-Cities Metropolitan Area and the Benton-Franklin-Walla Walla RTPO, 2001 – 2020 (RTP) was adopted in November 2001 by the Benton-Franklin Council of Governments Board. (http://www.benton-franklin.cog.wa.us/RTP.html)

The RTP addresses motorized transportation for the three-county area. It is a compilation of coordinated city, county and state planning efforts for the Tri-Cities urban area and the Benton-Franklin-Walla Walla counties region. It describes regional strategies to maintain and preserve

existing transportation systems, and add new capacity to more efficiently move growing volumes of traffic. It also recommends implementation and funding strategies, including investing in other ways to address traffic congestion. Its policies are intended to provide access to more transportation options, and to support more affordable and efficient movement of goods and people. The basis of this plan is each jurisdiction's 20-year Growth Management Act Comprehensive Plan.

Goals

The plan's goals are to develop a transportation system for the three counties that:

- Is integrated with local land use policies;
- Provides lower cost solutions in the form of transit, vanpool/carpool, Transportation Demand Management (TDM), bicycling, and walking, in lieu of expanding capacity;
- Gives access for goods, services and people, while minimizing total system costs;
- Provides access and mobility for all citizens regardless of age, race or handicap;
- Gives access while minimizing energy consumption and environmental impacts;
- Supports and meets the needs of sustained economic growth;
- Is consistent with local, regional, state and federal policies; and
- Assures improvements are consistent with and support the values of communities and neighborhood structures.

(Benton-Franklin Council of Governments, *Regional Transportation Plan for the Tri-Cities Metropolitan Area and the Benton-Franklin-Walla Walla RTPS*, 2001 – 2020, pp. 3-2 and 3-3)

Investment Strategies and Priorities

The RTP identifies 20 policies to guide transportation and land use planning, and transportation investments. The plan also includes specific action strategies for each policy.

Regional Transportation Policies:

- 1. Access for goods, services and people. The plan defines access as "the ability to reach desired destinations within a convenient proximity and time frame," whether by motor vehicle, transit, bicycle or foot. (RTP, p. 3-3)
- 2. **Access Management** to "balance the needs and access rights of adjacent property owners with the need of the traveling public to have smooth traffic flow, and to correlate those needs in proportion to a number of factors, such as development level, speed limit, and the functional classification of the highway." (RTP, p. 3-4) Access management protects the public investment in streets and highways, enhances safety, preserves capacity, and reduces air pollution and noise levels.
- 3. **Efficiency** to support a fast and economical transportation system for the public, and assure that the public is faced with the full costs of their transportation choices and that investment decisions maximize the benefits of the system.
- 4. **Balance** in modes of transportation, so that the transportation system: "(1) stresses multimodalism with minimum service standards; (2) provides transportation options; (3) avoids dependence on any particular mode, especially single occupancy vehicles; and (4) optimizes the efficiency of each mode." (RTP, p. 3-5)
- 5. **Safety** maintain and improve safety in all aspects of the transportation system.
- 6. **Environmental Responsibility** limit and mitigate adverse and harmful impacts on the environment.
- 7. **Transportation Financing** funding strategies that ensure regional financial stability for the transportation system.

- 8. **Intergovernmental Cooperation** to coordinate federal, state, regional and local comprehensive plans and policies, and emphasize cooperation among jurisdictions.
- 9. **Citizen Involvement and Public Education** to include citizen participation in all transportation-related decisions.
- 10. **Livability** support the needs and desires of citizens and their communities as they conduct their daily lives.
- 11. **Aesthetics** protect and enhance aesthetic values to support the economic well-being and livability for the region.
- 12. **Pedestrians and Bicycles** promote these as essential modes of transportation, and provide opportunities for safe and efficient use of pedestrian and bicycle facilities as a legitimate alternative to motorized travel.
- 13. **Transit Element** support the local transit systems and their goals and policies; promote offering alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle; and promote land use patterns that support transit use.
- 14. **Transportation Demand Management** promote low-cost solutions to capacity problems, and devise methods to avoid costly capital expenditures brought on by excessive use of single occupancy vehicles at peak hours.
- 15. **Streets and Highways** support a balanced and multimodal transportation network; be accessible for a variety of users; meet the needs to safely move people, goods and services; contribute to livability; and promote tourism.
- 16. **Land Use** support land uses that create livable communities, compact urban development and allow a multimodal transportation system to operate efficiently and decrease dependence on single occupancy vehicles.
- 17. **Air/Waterways/Rail** encourage air and rail passenger facilities and services, and river and rail freight facilities and services that enhance regional economic competitiveness.
- 18. **Freight Movement** encourage safe and efficient freight movement; support intermodal freight facilities; and ensure that any harmful effects of freight movement are mitigated.
- 19. **Intermodalism** encourage and maintain an accessible, intermodal passenger and freight network and transportation hubs, while maintaining an efficient and balanced transportation system.
- 20. **Regional Consistency and Certification** ensure that transportation plans are consistent with local and regional planning efforts and the Growth Management Act.

(RTP, pp. 3-3-3-20)

The RTP also sets six regional transportation strategies to implement the region's growth strategy.

Regional Transportation Strategies:

- Meet the transportation infrastructure needs of the region's major sources of economic growth and vitality.
- Support the coordination of land use and transportation decisions.
- Improve multi-jurisdictional coordination to avoid transportation system deficiencies.
- Promote efficient multimodal transportation systems and intermodal connections.
- Ensure sufficient rail and road access to the Snake and Columbia River port facilities, and ensure sufficient infrastructure (i.e., barge slips, docks, and storage facilities) at those ports.
- Promote least-cost planning and innovative financing strategies.

(RTP, pp. 11-3 - 11-4)

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

The RTP was developed jointly by the Benton-Franklin Council of Governments and its member jurisdictions. Each regional agency and jurisdiction had the opportunity to review and comment on the draft plan. The draft plan was also available for public review and was the subject of a number of public open houses and public meetings.

The RTPO will review and update the RTP at least every five years to reflect policy changes, technological advances, funding options and other needed changes.

Least-Cost Planning

The RTP is based on least-cost planning methodologies. The goals of these methods are to:

- Attain the most cost-effective facilities, services and programs for an integrated, multimodal regional transportation system;
- Ensure preservation of that system; and
- Make efficient use of facilities to relieve congestion and maximize mobility of people and goods.

(RTP, p. v)

The RTP also includes least-cost planning as one of its regional transportation strategies.

2. North Central Washington

Overview

The North Central Washington Regional Transportation Plan was adopted by the North Central Regional Transportation Planning Organization (NCRTPO) in 1998. It covers the three-county Chelan, Douglas and Okanogan region. The Wenatchee Valley Transportation Council (WVTC) is the lead agency for the NCRTPO. The 1998 plan is not available on the WVTC Web site. However, the 2006 – 2011 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, just published in October 2005, indicates that the NCRTPO has begun the process of updating that document, with completion anticipated in the summer of 2006.

The WVTC also leads the development of the long-range Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Wenatchee Valley, which includes the urban areas of the valley in Chelan and Douglas counties. The long-range plan for this region is *Confluence 2025 – A Strategic Transportation Plan for the Wenatchee Valley*, which was adopted August 11, 2005. (http://www.wvtc.org/index.php?page_id=32)

Since the North Central Region plan is not available, the following description is drawn from the regional plan for the Wenatchee Valley, *Confluence 2025*, and from the North Central Transportation Improvement Plan.

Goals

Urban Goals:

- 1. Public involvement in decision-making
- 2. Intergovernmental coordination
- 3. Transportation safety

- 4. Ease of travel to, from and within the community
- 5. Make the best use of the existing transportation system
- 6. Balanced travel options (balance investment in roadways, public transportation and non-motorized infrastructure)
- 7. Environmental stewardship
- 8. Adequate funding

(Wenatchee Valley Transportation Council, *Confluence 2025: A Strategic Transportation Plan for the Wenatchee Valley*, pp. B-2 – B-3)

Investment Strategies and Priorities

The urban plan, *Confluence 2025*, provides a set of "strategic efficiencies" to help pursue the goals and objectives to the plan.

"Strategic Efficiencies Toolbox":

- Access management to maintain an appropriate balance between access and mobility on roadways
- Sub-area planning to provide detailed policy guidance for developing areas
- Integrating multimodal transportation and land use to coordinate transportation needs with land use plans
- Target bicycle and pedestrian improvements to target investments in these facilities to maximize their benefit to the community
- Target transit service to reduce congestion
- Intelligent transportation systems to use technologies that improve transportation safety, capacity and maintenance

(Confluence 2025, pp. D-17 – D-21)

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

Planners from the WVTC worked with planners and engineers from the local jurisdictions and port districts, the transit system and WSDOT. The planning process also involved getting comments from local businesses, citizens and other interested parties. The WVTC's Executive Council, member jurisdictions and constituents worked together to define the goals and objectives for the regional transportation system, analyze current conditions, predict revenue levels, develop alternative scenarios, select transportation projects and set priories.

3. Northeast Washington Regional Transportation Planning Organization

Overview

The Northeast Washington Regional Transportation Planning Organization (NEW RTPO) develops the regional transportation plan for Ferry, Stevens and Pend Oreille counties. The lead agency is the Tri-County Economic Development District (TEDD), whose offices are in Colville.

This plan is not available on the Web.

4. Palouse

Overview

Palouse Regional Transportation Plan 2004 was prepared under the auspices of the Palouse Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO):

(http://www.palouse.org/rtpo/Palouse%20Regional%20Transportation%20Plan%20Final.pdf)

The Palouse Economic Development Council (PEDC) is its lead planning agency. The organization includes Asotin, Columbia, Garfield and Whitman counties. The Board of the PRTPO (made up of elected officials representing each jurisdiction within the four-county region) accepted the plan in June 2004.

The *Palouse Regional Transportation Plan 2005 Addendum* was developed at the request of the PRTPO Board to provide additional discussion about longer-range needs and issues, to correlate the region's key issues with statewide issues, and to evaluate pavement maintenance issues.

Goals

The plan states five goals:

- 1. **Provide multimodal transportation** systems that are based on regional priorities and are coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans, while optimizing the use of resources devoted to transportation improvements to provide a safe and efficient multimodal transportation system for the movement of people and goods.
- 2. **Encourage development** in areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.
- 3. **Encourage economic development** throughout the region that is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, promote economic opportunity for all citizens of the region, especially unemployed and disadvantaged persons, and encourage growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth, all within the capability of the natural resources, public services, and public facilities.
- 4. **Protect the environment** and enhance the planning area's high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water.
- 5. **Encourage the involvement of citizens** in the transportation planning process, and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts.

(Palouse Regional Transportation Planning Organization, *Palouse Regional Transportation Plan* 2004, pp. 3-4)

Investment Strategies and Priorities

The policies attached to each of the above five goals provide guidance for investments.

Policies:

- 1.1 Reflect the link between transportation facilities and land use.
- 1.2 Provide the safest roadway possible.
- 1.3 Maintain "C" level of service on all rural regional roadways and "D" on all urban facilities of regional significance.
- 1.4 Preserve the ability to move freight by rail, barge and air.
- 1.5 Provide safe places for bicycle and pedestrian travel.
- 1.6 Maintain and improve access to recreational opportunities for residents and visitors.
- 1.7 Place a high priority on safety projects.

- 1.8 Place priority on maintenance and preservation first, and new construction second.
- 2. Plan for and provide transportation facilities and services so they will be available as new people and jobs arrive within the region.
- 3. Promote economic development and manage growth to serve the needs and vision of the region.
- 4. Protect the environment as possible by: (a) protecting critical areas; (b) reducing air pollution; (c) reducing transportation-related sources of water contaminants; (d) providing context-sensitive design and practices; and (e) supporting growth within areas that can absorb it.
- 5. Provide meaningful citizen involvement in regional transportation planning.

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

The plan was developed beginning with meetings with elected officials in each county, and opportunities for public input. Meetings were held with county engineers, and with city and port district representatives. A meeting was held with the full PRTPO Board to discuss the goals and policies of the plan.

5. Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization

Overview

The *Peninsula Regional Transportation Plan* (RTP) was adopted by the Executive Council of the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO) on June 16, 1995. (http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/partners/prtpo/pdfs/chapter2.pdf *Note:* Only the "Regional Goals and Policies" chapter is available online.) This is a multimodal transportation plan that addresses the road system and tourism, freight, non-motorized, transit and ferry travel in Clallam, Jefferson, Kitsap and Mason counties. (*Note:* Kitsap County is also a member of the Puget Sound Regional Council.) The PRTPO includes representatives of the four counties, plus nine cities, four transit agencies, 10 tribal nations, four port districts and four major employers.

Goals

The Peninsula RTP sets regional goals and policies for transportation planning. These are defined as follows: "The goals provide the vision of the transportation system, and the policies provide the guiding framework for implementing the vision." (Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization, *Peninsula Regional Transportation Plan*, 1995, p. 2-1) The goals are as follows. The Plan notes that the list is not in a priority order.

Regional Goals

- 1. Overall Goals:
 - a. **Modes** Coordinate travel between different modes (road, ferry, airport, bus, freight, marine).
 - b. **Reduce SOV** Support reducing the reliance on the single occupant vehicle, and increasing use of alternative modes in urban growth areas and in regional commuter traffic.
- 2. <u>Level of Service</u>:
 - a. **Safety** Emphasize the safe movement of people and goods.

b. **Arterial and transit** – Establish regionally coordinated service objectives of arterial and transit facilities within the region to encourage the efficient use of the existing regional transportation system.

3. <u>Airports</u>:

- a. **Location** Recognize the region's air transportation needs by including a system of airports located to conveniently serve the area's population.
- b. **Land use** Prevent land use conflicts around the region's airports.

4. Freight:

- a. **Mobility** –Support the economic vitality of the Kitsap/Olympic Peninsula region, and prepare for long-term freight mobility needs.
- b. **Safety** Provide for a safe and efficient transportation system for freight.

5. Highways:

- a. **Efficiency** Increase the efficiency of the regional highway system by maximizing use of existing facilities. (Includes passing lanes, access management, transportation demand management, alternatives to SOVs.)
- b. **Quality** Support improving the quality of travel on the regional system. (Includes scenic vistas, litter cleanup, sign control, bicycle routes.)
- c. **Safety** Improve travel safety on the regional system.

6. Bikes, Paths and Trails:

- a. **Opportunities** Provide a range of non-motorized opportunities within the Regional Transportation System.
- b. **Off-highway facilities** Plan and construct separate, off-highway bicycle trail facilities, when economically feasible, along the regional transportation system. Refers to facilities not immediately adjacent to highways, and either within or outside existing local or state right-of-way.
- c. **Map** Produce a Regional Bike, Path and Trail Map.

Investment Strategies and Priorities

The Peninsula RTP states: "Priorities have not been placed on any of the goals and policies." (Peninsula RTP, p. 2-1) However, another section does provide the following needs and priorities (http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/partners/prtpo/pdfs/PRTPO_priorities.pdf).

PRTPO Needs:

- Congestion Management
- Operation, Maintenance, Preservation and Special Needs Transportation
- Freight Movement

Transportation Priorities:

- SR 104 The Hood Canal Floating Bridge (Project examples: maintenance, preservation, widening multimodal improvements)
- US 101 (Project examples: widening, minimizing erosion and landslides, safety, freight and commuter alternatives)
- Rural Character and Economic Opportunities (Project examples: freight truck access, interchange improvements)
- Ferry Service (Project example: addition of passenger-only ferry service)
- Transit, Bike and Pedestrian Transportation (Project examples: connections at transfer facilities, public transportation services and equipment, trail construction)

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

The PRTPO's Technical Advisory Committee developed the draft regional goals and policies for the plan for review and adoption by the Policy Board, and then by the Executive Board. The Technical Advisory Committee consists of governmental staff and interested individuals with specialties in transportation, transportation management or public policy. The Policy Board consists of representatives of public and private organizations. The Executive Council members are local elected officials representing the four counties and nine cities in the PRTPO.

The portions of the RTP that are available on the PRTPO Web site do not indicate whether there was more general public involvement in development of the plan.

6. Puget Sound Regional Council

Overview

The investment priorities and process for the Puget Sound region are set in *Destination 2030*, a transportation plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) in March 2001, and updated by a "2004 Progress Report" and an amendment to the plan's project list adopted in March 2005. (http://www.psrc.org/projects/mtp/d2030plan.htm)

Destination 2030 details transportation improvements and programs to support the Puget Sound region's growth strategy. It sets transportation policies for the region, lists regional transportation needs and an investment strategy based on those needs, describes a financial strategy, and discusses implementation and monitoring strategies. Destination 2030 is a multimodal plan for streets, highways, ferries, transit systems, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and freight and aviation facilities. It is based on serving local needs and providing personal choices, informed by the region's coordinated strategy for future growth, which is called VISION 2020.

The PSRC is about to embark on a major update of this plan in conjunction with an update of VISION 2020. As part of this process, there will be a plan amendment to *Destination 2030* in 2007, and a fully updated plan in 2008 to reflect the direction set by the updated VISION 2020. Together, VISION 2020 and *Destination 2030* respond to Washington's Growth Management Act and conform to federal transportation planning requirements.

Goals

The plan's goals are to:

- **Support maintenance and preservation** of existing transportation infrastructure and services as a high priority.
- Provide stronger links between the transportation system and land use development to encourage growth within defined urban growth areas with balanced investments in multimodal transportation improvements.
- **Identify and prioritize projects, programs and policies** to improve all modes of transportation, and keep up with growth.
- Improve the region's financial capacity to fund needed investments.
- Tailor recommendations at the sub-regional and corridor levels, in recognition of the region's social, physical and cultural diversity.

(Puget Sound Regional Council, *Destination 2030*, p. 2)

Investment Strategy and Priorities

The investment strategy for *Destination 2030* focuses on "the transportation systems that operate at a regionally significant scale and can influence the region's long-term growth, development and quality of life." (*Destination 2030*, p. 27) The investment strategy consists of multimodal transportation facilities and services that are crucial to the mobility and access needs of the region. The starting point for the strategy is a set of Investment Principles to guide decision-making. These principles form the investment priorities in the plan.

Investment Principles:

- 1. The first priority should be to maintain, preserve, make safe, and optimize existing transportation infrastructure and services.
- 2. Investments should emphasize continuity and complete discrete elements of the transportation system. Completing missing pieces of larger systems is a regional investment priority.
- 3. Appropriate investments in all modes should be emphasized to provide an array of travel choices.
- 4. Transportation investments should be directly linked with measurable transportation, environmental and land use outcomes, and should support the achievement of regional and state benchmarks.
- 5. Cost-effective transportation options to addressing identified problems should be demonstrated and implemented.
- 6. Compact development of designated urban centers, high-capacity transit station areas, and other communities should be supported through direct investment.

(Destination 2030, pp. 27-29)

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

Destination 2030 was developed by the elected leaders of the PSRC with the advice and involvement of business, environmental and community interests. The plan was developed following the procedures for an Environmental Impact Statement. Between mid-1999 and mid-2000, the PSRC sought public comments on the scope of environmental review, then conducted extensive outreach to elicit comments and advice that would guide development of the plan. The PSRC then developed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), which it released for public review and comment in August 2000.

The PSRC applied least-cost analysis to the transportation alternatives included in the DEIS (see below). The agency also conducted a broad analysis of potential environmental impacts. The plan development was reviewed for environmental justice considerations to ensure that the burdens and benefits of implementing it are not distributed inequitably across citizens based on race, income, age or disability. In addition, *Destination 2030* programs and projects were reviewed for their impact on air quality to ensure conformity with federal and state laws.

The PSRC released the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in March 2001 and *Destination* 2030 in May 2001. The priority projects are included in Appendix 9 of the plan. It includes projects of counties, cities and agencies that the PSRC has approved as being of regional significance. The list is updated periodically. The most recent update is dated June 27, 2005.

Least-Cost Planning

In Washington state, regional transportation planning organizations are required to apply least-cost planning analysis to transportation investment strategies. The Washington Administrative Code defines least-cost planning as "a process of comparing direct and indirect costs of demand and supply options to meet transportation goals and/or policies where the intent of the process is to identify the most cost-effective mix of options." (WAC 468-86-030 and WAC 468-86-080, as cited in *Destination 2030*, p. 8) Least-cost planning involves considering all the resource costs for alternative investments, and gathering information about investment selection and priorities. It combines strategic systems planning with the cost-benefit analysis of the accounting field.

Destination 2030 indicates that the PSRC applied the methods of least-cost planning to develop the transportation alternatives. The report notes that least-cost planning is not an exact science, and is subject to the influence of analytical uncertainty. But it provides some insight into the cost effectiveness and the cost components of different alternatives for the plan.

Destination 2030 offers the following "significant findings from the least-cost analysis of system alternatives":

- When faced with a large increase in the demand for trip-making, regional transportation systems begin to perform poorly if only small actions are taken to directly address additional travel demand.
- Addressing environmental and congestion problems through capital-intensive supply-side solutions is expensive.
- Programs that manage transportation systems for more efficiency and that offer opportunities to meet travel demand through shorter, higher occupancy, off-peak vehicle trips (or using no motorized vehicle at all) may significantly reduce costs beyond the projects and programs analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
- In addition to capital infrastructure costs and congestion costs, one of the most critical variables relating to total transportation system costs (public and private) is the total vehicle miles traveled for all personal travel trips.

(*Destination 2030*, p. 9)

7. Quad County Regional Transportation Planning Organization

Overview

The *Quad County Regional Transportation Plan* was adopted by the council of the Quad County Regional Transportation Planning Organization (Quadco) on June 8, 1994 (not available online). Quadco includes Adams, Grant, Kittitas and Lincoln counties. The plan describes the transportation system of the region and its current usage, and projects its function 20 years into the future. It considers system needs to meet the projected mobility, economic, social and environmental goals of the region.

Goals

The Quad County Plan supports six general policy goals, and multiple objectives for each goal. The goals are:

- Economic Growth and Vitality
- Coordination among Jurisdictions and the Private Sector

- System Capacity and Improvement
- Roadway Improvements
- Public Transportation
- Land Use

(Quad County Regional Transportation Plan 1994, pp. II-20 – II-23)

Investment Strategies and Priorities

The plan provides two sets of strategies to address the needs and deficiencies identified in the regional transportation system—one group for general transportation needs and one for regional policy goals.

General Transportation Strategies:

- **Safety:** Improve transportation system safety.
- **Investment Value:** Implement projects with the highest investment value.
- **System Continuity:** Ensure system continuity.
- System Efficiency: Eliminate deficiencies that reduce system efficiency.
- Multimodal Solutions: Provide multimodal solutions to transportation problems.

Regional Policy Strategic Targets:

- **Regional Development:** Meet the transportation infrastructure needs of the region's major sources of economic growth and vitality.
- Land Use/Transportation Coordination: Support the coordination of land use and transportation decisions.
- **Multijurisdictional Coordination:** Improve multijurisdictional coordination to eliminate transportation system deficiencies.

(Quad County RTP, pp. VI-1 – IV-3)

The plan then identifies projects that are of importance to the region and that support the above strategies. The plan also establishes the following criteria for determining priorities:

Priority Criteria:

- Projects that address three or more of the strategies or the selection criteria are deemed the most important.
- Facilities or services with a major deficiency are considered even if they do not address any other criteria or strategies.

(Quad County RTP, p. IV-3)

The high priority projects are in five categories:

- 1. Improvements for Freight Movement
- 2. Improvements for Rail
- 3. Improvements to Accommodate Growth
- 4. Improvements to Accommodate Recreational Traffic
- 5. Improvement for Public Transportation

(Quad County RTP, pp. E-5 - E-7)

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

Development of the Quad County RTP included an analysis of existing planning documents, and regional resource and facility documents from county economic development offices. In addition, the planners sought public input through a mail-out survey, which was returned by 132 individuals, and a series of interviews with a variety of transportation interests. (Quad County RTP, p. II-1) The RTP was adopted by the council of Quadco on June 8, 1994.

Quadco reviews the plan at least every two years. This includes reviewing the planning efforts of local jurisdictions to determine if elements in the RTP need to be revised to coordinate better with local plans. The RTP sets out a sequential approach for a continuing planning process, and an approach to data analysis to review existing and future trends. (Quad County RTP, pp. IV-46 – IV-49)

8. Skagit Council of Governments

Overview

The *Skagit Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sub-Regional Transportation Plan Update* (MTP/S-RTP), dated August 2005 (http://www.scog.net/home/), combines two planning efforts:

- 1. the Skagit Sub-Regional Transportation Plan (S-RTP), prepared by the Skagit-Island Regional Transportation Planning Organization; and
- 2. the Skagit Metropolitan Transportation Plan (SMTP), prepared by the Skagit Metropolitan Planning Organization, which includes Mt. Vernon, Burlington, Sedro Woolley and adjacent areas.

The Skagit Council of Governments is the lead planning agency for both transportation planning efforts.

Goals

The plan lays out a set of policies and goals each for the Skagit MPO and the Skagit S-RTP. The policies are broad statements and the goals are a detailed list of actions related to each policy. The following are the policies for the Skagit S-RTP, and a summary of the goals related to each policy.

Skagit Sub-RTP Policies:

- 1. **Efficiency and effectiveness** Identify, encourage and implement strategies and projects that will maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of the regional transportation system through a cooperative effort with member agencies, the Metropolitan Planning Organization, the public sector, and state and federal agencies.
- 2. **Regional significance** Provide a Sub-Regional Transportation Plan that identifies regionally significant transportation facilities and services that support local comprehensive plans, and ensures ongoing evaluation to keep current with local, metropolitan, inter-regional, state, federal and public needs and requirements.
- 3. **System integrity** Protect the integrity of the investment in the existing transportation system by encouraging timely maintenance.
- 4. **Cooperation** Facilitate cooperation and information exchange among stakeholders in the subregion.
- 5. **Public involvement** Maintain and execute an ongoing public involvement program to ensure the early, meaningful and continuous participation of the citizens of Skagit County in the planning process.

(Skagit Council of Governments, *Skagit Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sub-Regional Transportation Plan Update*, 2005, pp. V-5 and V-6)

Summary of Goals:

- Goals for Policy 1: Efficient mix of modes based on balancing accessibility and demand; mode interconnections to best serve users; level of service across modes to meet users' needs; safety and security of users; accessibility through connections and information; access management plans.
- Goals for Policy 2: Regional growth strategy based on growth management plans of jurisdictions; identify and add needed auxiliary components; plan amendment process that accommodates changes in needs.
- Goals for Policy 3: Monitor the condition of existing facilities; timely replacement and rehabilitation; ensure operation, appearance and functionality of infrastructure.
- Goals for Policy 4: Forum for stakeholders to coordinate projects and plans with each other; technical support for local and other agencies on the transportation plan; facilitate the private sector's involvement; identify funding sources.
- Goals for Policy 5: Public involvement plan; opportunities for review and comment on proposed amendments; two-way communication; public input into decisions; consider public comments in decision-making.

(SMTP/S-RTP Update, pp. V-6 – V-8)

Investment Strategies and Priorities

The plan does not directly discuss investment strategies or priorities. However, the plan does lay out a set of criteria "to cover a range of concerns, transportation performance, the environment, social impacts and finances." (SMTP/S-RTP Update, p. V-4) The criteria are to help inform agencies as to the effects of increased travel and the infrastructure to support growth. These criteria are:

- Congestion
- Intermodal connectivity
- System usage
- Cost effectiveness

- Displacements
- Air quality
- Wetland impacts
- Floodplain impacts
- Consistency with local plans

(SMTP/S-RTP Update, p. V-5)

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

The Skagit Council of Governments developed and carried out a public involvement plan for the development of MTP/S-RTP. This included a set of "key-person interviews," two sets of open houses, a newsletter, and a questionnaire distributed at the open houses and through the newsletter. At the public open houses, residents had an opportunity to meet with project staff, learn about the transportation plan development, ask questions and provide feedback. There was also a Web site with project information and where responses to the questionnaires were posted.

The draft plans, and especially the policies and goals, were reviewed and revised by a Technical Advisory Committee and the Policy Board of the Regional Transportation Planning Organization. The Policy Board is composed of elected officials from the county, cities, tribe, ports, SCOG and WSDOT. They are the decision-making body for this plan.

Least-Cost Planning

The plan does incorporate least-cost planning, following the principles of least-cost planning (referring to a report of the Federal Highway Administration, entitled "Least Cost Planning: Principles, Applications and Issues.") These principles are:

- An emphasis on developing system-level plans;
- Consideration of all alternatives, including demand management approaches;
- Explicit accounting for uncertainty in the estimation of benefits and costs;
- Public involvement in the decision-making process;
- Coordination amongst jurisdictions; and
- Monitoring and updating plans to reflect new information about demand for different facilities and the cost-effectiveness of different approaches.

(MTP/S-RTP, p. VII-8)

The plan describes how the process for developing the Skagit S-RTP and the plan itself incorporates these principles. (MTP/S-RTP, pp. VII-8 – 9)

9. Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council

Overview

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Clark County (MTP) was adopted by the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) in December 2002, and amended in December 2003. The RTC is now in the process of updating the plan, and released a draft update in November 2005. (http://www.rtc.wa.gov/programs/mtp/outline.htm)

The plan identifies future regional transportation system needs, and outlines multimodal transportation plans and improvements needed to maintain mobility for people and freight in and

through the region, as well as accessibility to land uses in the region. It identifies travel needs, recommends policies and strategies, and identifies implementation programs to meet future needs.

Goals

The goals of the plan are to:

- Support community economic development.
- Provide for an acceptable level of mobility for personal travel and freight movement throughout the regional transportation network, and adequate access to locations throughout the region.
- Provide for a balanced regional transportation system that allows for the development of the highway, bus transit, high-capacity transit, rail, aviation, marine, bicycle and pedestrian modes, as well as emphasis on transportation demand management and transportation system management strategies.
- Recommend transportation improvements that will minimize and/or mitigate environmental impacts. Recommended transportation improvements should be consistent with community environmental values and neighborhood structures.
- Consider safety as a prime concern in development of the regional transportation system.
- Identify cost-effective recommendations, those solutions that provide adequate mobility to the users, while minimizing total system costs.
- Recommend transportation improvements for which revenues are likely to be available to build or implement the improvement. The MTP has to be "fiscally constrained."

(Southwest Regional Transportation Council, *Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Clark County*, p. 1-2)

Investment Strategy and Priorities

Chapter 5 in the MTP describes the following "solutions and strategies" needed for development of a balanced regional transportation system that will provide an adequate level of regional mobility and accessibility over the next 20 years to support the region's land use goals.

Solutions and Strategies:

- 1. Maintain the existing regional transportation system.
- 2. Preserve the existing regional transportation system.
- 3. Address bridge deficiencies.
- 4. Address safety deficiencies.
- 5. Support economic development.
- 6. Promote strategic investments in the highway freight transportation system.
- 7. Maintain and improve the freight rail system.
- 8. Help to improve the marine freight system.
- 9. Support the development of non-motorized (pedestrian and bicycle) transportation modes.
- 10. Use transportation demand management to maximize the efficiency of the existing transportation system.
- 11. Use transportation system management strategies to maximize the efficiency of the existing transportation system.
- 12. Support transit system improvements.
- 13. Use Jobs Access/Reverse Commute Plan for workers' transportation and develop a regional welfare-to-work transportation plan.

- 14. Develop high-capacity transportation.
- 15. Address commuter rail/rail capacity issues.
- 16. Address regional congestion issues through the Congestion Management System developed as part of Clark County's federal Transportation Management Area plans.
- 17. Address environmental issues air and water quality.

(MTP, pp. 5-1 - 5-12)

As part of the plan development, the Regional Transportation Council engaged in a prioritization process. The following key policy issues emerged as the most important for project prioritization:

Priority Issues:

- Economic development
- Land use and transportation system performance
- Transportation demand management
- Funding
- Bi-state transportation strategy

(MTP, p. 5-13)

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

The RTP was developed through a coordinated process among local jurisdictions in Clark County, and adopted by the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council. There are 23 jurisdictions on the Council. The plan development included a variety of public involvement efforts on a local and regional basis. At a minimum, an annual public meeting is held on the plan to allow the public to review the status of the plan's development.

The MTP is reviewed for currency every two years, and updated at least every three years. A 2005 draft update is currently out for public review and comment.

10. Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Planning Organization (Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments)

Overview

The Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Longview-Kelso-Rainier metropolitan area, and also serves as the lead agency for the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SWRTPO) for Cowlitz, Grays Harbor, Lewis, Pacific and Wahkiakum counties. (http://www.cwcog.org/transportation.html)

The Regional Transportation Improvement Program: Longview-Kelso-Rainier MPO and Southwest RTPO 2006-2008 represents the transportation plan for both the Longview-Kelso-Rainier metropolitan area and the five-county region. It provides a 20-year long-range plan for 2003 – 2022, and lists projects that participating agencies are planning for the next six years. This plan was adopted by the Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments Board in 2003.

Goals

The *Regional Transportation Improvement Program* (RTIP) lists both the MPO and RTPO goals for the Regional Transportation Plan for the next 20 years.

MPO Transportation Goals

- 1. Provide for a convenient, safe and efficient transportation/circulation network among the major areas of trip generation in the MPO area.
- 2. Enhance the effectiveness of the existing transportation system.
- 3. Provide a public transportation and quasi-public transportation access for all urban area residents who require such service.
- 4. Improve pedestrian and bicycle safety in the transportation network.

RTPO Goals

- 1. **Growth management** –Support the overall goals of the Growth Management Act, with emphasis on the transportation elements, for those counties planning under growth management, and for overall policy direction for those counties not planning under growth management. Land use and development activities should strive to protect the unique, small-community and rural character of the five-county region.
- 2. **Highways, roads and streets** Maintain and improve a network of highways, arterial and collector roads and streets that move people and goods safely and efficiently through the region, while minimizing social and environmental impacts and supporting various means of travel.
- 3. **Public transit** Seek to provide public transportation throughout the five-county region.
- 4. **Rail** Expand passenger and freight rail throughout the region by promoting the federally designated Pacific Northwest High-Speed Rail Corridor to provide improved inter-city passenger rail service as a viable, efficient and cost-effective alternative to automobile and air travel, and an effective way to relieve congestion on the region's highway and aviation system. Improvements to passenger rail service will also increase the freight capacity and relieve congestion on the mainline railway.
- 5. **Freight mobility** Maintain safety, efficiency and a high level of service for freight movement by trucks. Freight mobility improvements should be prioritized for identified corridors serving industrial areas access for the state highway system.
- 6. **Rivers and ports** Encourage the continued vitality of the Columbia River/Snake River transportation system and the coastal ports, which support the communities in the five counties, allowing access to world markets for local and foreign products. Encourage efforts to improve recreation and access to the Columbia River ports.
- 7. **Air** Develop an appropriate air transportation system that emphasizes accessibility and enables the efficient movement of people, goods and freight. Cooperate with entities in the region to ensure that this system adequately serves residents, business and economic development, as well as emergency and tourist activities. The system should also be well-connected with existing intermodal facilities, including the enhancement of passenger rail and highway systems serving the region.
- 8. **Bicycle and pedestrian** Encourage bicycle and pedestrian travel to reduce auto congestion and promote healthier communities.
- 9. **Integrated system** Increase connections and accessibility among all transportation modes to create an integrated transportation system.
- 10. **Coordination** Coordinate state, regional and local transportation plans to assure transportation facilities crossing jurisdictional boundaries are developed and improved in a consistent manner.

11. **Funding** – Establish sufficient funding to implement planned transportation projects and services. This plan gives high priority to maintenance, preservation and safety improvements. (Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments, *Regional Transportation Improvement Program: Longview-Kelso-Rainier MPO and Southwest RTPO 2006-2008*, pp. 10-11)

Investment Strategies and Priorities

The plan notes that federally funded projects have been prioritized by the MPO/RTPO year:

- Priority 1: 2006 projects
- Priority 2: 2007 projects
- Priority 3: 2008 projects

In addition, the plan indicates the following criteria for ranking the MPO projects:

- Provides significant regional benefit
- Preserves the existing transportation system
- Increases capacity and mobility
- Increases safety
- Facilitates alternative transportation modes and intermodalism.

(Cowlitz-Wahkiakum RTP, p. 9)

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

To develop the plan, the Council worked with local and state officials, regional and local transit operators and other agencies that may affect transportation activities. Public input was sought during the Council meeting process. The Council also posted the plan on its Web site for public comment before adoption. The Council's Board adopted the plan.

Adding a project to the plan requires an amendment, with approval by resolution of the Council. However, modifications to reflect changes in funding levels and scope can be accomplished through the Council staff and the Technical Advisory Committee of the Council.

11. Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Overview

The Spokane Metropolitan Area – Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), dated July 2003, was prepared Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) by the (http://www.srtc.org/Metropolitan%20Transportation%20Plan.htm). It is a 20-year plan for Spokane County's regional transportation system. The SRTC is the Metropolitan Planning Agency for Spokane County, and includes representatives from the City of Spokane, Spokane County, and WSDOT. The purpose of the MTP is "to document the intermodal approach that will be taken to develop Spokane's regional transportation system in order to meet the mobility of people, freight, and goods movement between now and the year 2025." (Spokane Metropolitan Area – Metropolitan *Transportation Plan*, p. 1-4)

Goals

The SRTC adopted goals and policies for guiding and directing development of the MTP. These are based on countywide planning policies. The goals and policies include a mission statement, two overall goals based on this mission, and detailed policies in eight areas.

Mission Statement:

Spokane's regional transportation system shall provide for the efficient movement of people and goods into and through the Spokane Region with an emphasis on integration of balanced multimodal transportation choices. (Spokane MTP, p. 2-1)

Overall Goals:

- 1. **Safety, efficiency, quality of life:** "Spokane's regional transportation system shall provide for the safe an efficient movement of people and goods throughout the Spokane region, while seeking to enhance the area's quality of life, efficiently using limited resources, and ensuring that transportation solutions are compatible with the rights of citizens to the peaceful and healthy enjoyment of life, home and property."
- 2. **Multimodal:** "Develop a balanced, integrated, multimodal transportation system, which serves the existing and future needs of the area and provides a convenient choice among modes for trips into and out of Spokane's metropolitan area, for work, school, shopping, personal business, and recreational purposes."

(Spokane MTP, p. 2-1)

Policy Areas:

- General Land Use Policies Related to Transportation
- General Non-Motorized Transportation Policies
- High-Capacity Transportation Policies
- Freight and Goods Transportation Policies
- Parking Policies
- Single Occupant Vehicle Policies
- Environmental Policies
- Financial Policies
- Public Involvement Policies

(Spokane MTP, pp. 2-2-2-10)

Summary:

The regional transportation system must:

- Meet the mobility needs of both individuals and commerce.
- Improve the environment through reduced reliance on the single occupant vehicle and by emphasizing good alternate means of transportation.
- Give special consideration to addressing mobility needs of the transportation disadvantaged to ensure that the system meets the diverse needs of people in the community.
- Be capable of being implemented, including adequately identifying and addressing impacts, having financing reasonably available, and enabling the community to maintain or improve overall quality of life.

(Spokane MTP, p. 2-10)

Investment Strategies and Priorities

The SRTC identified projects based on the Regional Transportation Goals and Policies, the analysis of existing conditions and forecasts, and the identified transportation deficiencies. The proposed solutions were then evaluated by the following criteria:

- Ability to address transportation challenges.
- Meets environmental constraints.
- Meets financial constraints.
- Conforms to air quality standards and does not delay attainment of standards or create new air quality hot spots.

(Spokane MTP, p. 1-6)

Beyond these criteria, the plan does not provide investment strategies or priorities.

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

The plan included participation by local jurisdictions, plus public involvement through a Citizens' Advisory Committee on Transportation, focus groups, telephone surveys, field surveys, mail-back surveys, volunteers, neighborhood and community groups, informational meetings, charrettes, videos, public access channels, paid advertising, community workshops, in-school educational classes, and open houses. The SRTC also made a special emphasis on reaching out to populations of under-represented people and the transportation-disadvantaged. They connected with community groups that act as advocates for some of the disadvantaged communities.

12. Thurston Regional Planning Council

Overview

The 2025 Thurston Regional Transportation Plan: Guiding Our Future (RTP) was adopted by the Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC) on May 7, 2004. (http://www.trpc.org/programs/transportation/regional+planning/2025+regional+transportation+plan.htm) This is a 20-year plan that serves as a "strategic blueprint" for the region's transportation system. The TRPC is an intergovernmental board of local governments within the county (cities, towns, county, transit, utilities, school districts), plus the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation and the Nisqually Tribe.

Goals

The TRPC established guiding principles for the transportation plan, along with transportation goals and policies.

Overall Goal for the RTP:

To develop a transportation system that offers, safe, efficient, affordable travel choices for people and goods, while supporting land use plans and long-term quality of life objectives. (2025 Thurston Regional Transportation Plan: Guiding Our Future, p. GP-2)

Guiding Principles:

Transportation decisions and investments will be:

- Supportive
- Responsive
- Fiscally Responsible

- Safety Conscious
- Environmentally Sensitive
- Collaborative

(Thurston RTP, pp. GP-2 – GP-3)

Goals:

The goals and policies "translate the region's Guiding Principles into a more detailed framework for transportation decision-making at all levels of government." The RTP groups the goals under four aspects of transportation planning and implementation. For each goal, the plan lists a series of policies to work toward the goal. Following are the goal areas and goals.

• Transportation Relationships:

- 1. <u>Transportation and Land Use Consistency:</u> Ensure that the design and function of transportation facilities are consistent with and support healthy urban, suburban and rural communities.
- 2. <u>Multimodal Transportation System:</u> Work toward an integrated multimodal transportation system that supports adopted land use plans, increases travel options, and reduces overall need to drive alone.
- 3. <u>Barrier-Free Transportation:</u> Ensure transportation system investments support the special travel needs of youth, elders, people with disabilities, literacy or language barriers, and those with low incomes.

• System Management:

- 4. <u>System Safety and Security:</u> Promote the safety and security of those who use, operate and maintain the transportation system.
- 5. <u>System Maintenance and Repair:</u> Protect investments that have already been made in the transportation system and keep life-cycle costs as low as possible.
- 6. <u>Travel Demand Management:</u> Increase overall operating efficiency of the transportation system through the effective use of measures that reduce the need to drive alone at peak periods.
- 7. <u>Transportation Technologies:</u> Use technology-based approaches to address transportation congestion, safety, efficiency and operations.
- 8. <u>Freight Mobility:</u> Promote efficient, cost-effective and safe movement of freight in and through the region.

• System Components:

- 9. <u>Streets, Roads and Bridges:</u> Establish a street and road network that provides for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods while supporting adopted land use goals.
- 10. <u>Public Transportation:</u> Provide an appropriate level of reliable, effective public transportation options commensurate with the region's evolving needs.
- 11. <u>Biking:</u> Increase the share of all trips made safely and conveniently by biking.
- 12. Walking: Increase the share of all trips made safely and conveniently by walking.
- 13. <u>Rail:</u> Ensure the long-term viability and continued use of existing rail lines in the region for freight and passenger rail travel.
- 14. <u>Aviation:</u> Provide an appropriate level of facilities and services to meet the general aviation needs of residents and businesses in the region.
- 15. <u>Marine Transportation:</u> Provide an appropriate level of facilities and services to meet the region's marine transportation needs.

Process:

- 16. <u>Public Involvement:</u> Convene ongoing community discussions and public input into regional transportation planning and decision-making processes.
- 17. <u>Intergovernmental Coordination:</u> Ensure transportation facilities and programs function seamlessly across community borders and between regions.
- 18. <u>Environmental and Human Health:</u> Minimize transportation impacts on the natural environment and the people who live and work in the Thurston region.
- 19. <u>Performance Measures:</u> Develop performance measures that are efficient to administer, effective in assessing performance, and meaningful to the public.
- 20. <u>Transportation Funding:</u> Ensure that transportation revenues provide maximum public benefit and support adopted land use strategies.

(Thurston RTP, pp. 3-1-3-3)

Investment Strategies and Priorities

The RTP sets work program priorities and identifies regionally significant projects, which impact travel over a large area. The plan "groups work program priorities by general topic, with no specific priority or sequence implied in the list." (Thurston RTP, p. 2-2) These groups and priorities are as follows.

Work Program Priorities:

Land Use:

- Vision/Reality Disconnect Project to align marketplace realities with the Comprehensive Plans.
- o Extend the forecast horizon beyond 20-25 years.
- o Identify critical regional corridors for future street, rail and trail needs.

• System Performance:

- o Identify additional system measures to augment vehicle congestion calculations.
- o Conduct time-of-day evaluations.
- o Realign expectations and level of service standards.
- o Evaluate rural road measures.

• Funding:

- o Pursue policy solutions for local funding options.
- o Investigate equitable transportation development fees.
- o Use innovative funding mechanisms.
- o Identify financial impacts of land use decisions.
- o Develop appropriate benefit/cost analysis tools.

• System Efficiency:

- o Utilize transportation technology to improve safety and efficiency.
- o Increase operations coordination.
- o Make intersections safer, simpler and smarter.
- o Pursue cost-effective retrofit and upgrade of facilities.
- **Passenger Rail and Public Transportation:** Develop the role of passenger rail and identify future options, and examine the role of bus transportation.
- **Freight Mobility:** Explore opportunities for regional coordination in supporting freight mobility.

- **Regional Trail Strategy:** Ensure an effective trail system that functions seamlessly as part of the larger transportation system.
- Transportation Outreach: Develop and pursue an ongoing outreach/input strategy to broaden general awareness of transportation issues and bring people into the decision-making process at the most productive time.

(Thurston RTP, pp. 2-1 - 2-5)

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

The development of the RTP involved regional policy makers and other partners, plus a public outreach effort. Public outreach included community discussion groups, rural and urban focus groups, informal written surveys, and roundtables and public meetings. In addition, planners reviewed the policies, plans and projects of partner agencies and organizations, and the requirements of federal and state law.

Least-Cost Planning

The RTP notes that the state requires regional transportation planners to consider least-cost planning in developing recommendations. The plan notes that to truly follow through and calculate every cost and benefit for many different options, and to use sensitivity analysis to assess some of the more intangible costs is not feasible for a region the size of Thurston County.

Instead, the planners note that the region has used least-cost solutions in incremental steps, such as supporting travel demand management, and building more transportation-efficient communities. The RTP supports the concepts inherent in least-cost planning, for example in recommending Surface Transportation Program fund investment in projects that make the system safer or more efficient instead of bigger. (Thurston RTP, pp. 5-4-5-5)

13. Whatcom County Council of Governments

Overview

The Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) in Whatcom County is administered through the Whatcom County Council of Governments (WCOG). The Whatcom Transportation Policy Board, an arm of the Council of Governments, developed the *Whatcom Transportation Plan:* A Combined Metropolitan and Regional Plan (WTP), which was approved by the RTPO Policy Board on October 10, 2001 (http://www.wcog.org/DesktopDefault.aspx?tabid=96). This is a 20-year, multimodal plan. The Policy Board is composed of 15 representatives from local governments in the county.

Goals

The WTP includes 14 goals, with associated policies. The public/private Transportation Task Force drafted these goals and policies initially.

Goals:

- 1. **Public Information and Education:** Raise the public's level of awareness about regional transportation issues, laws and regulations, and alternative transportation modes.
- 2. **Safety:** High-quality, safe, convenient, accessible, cost-effective transportation services throughout Whatcom County.

- 3. Access: Plan for transportation facilities and services that balance access to jobs, educational opportunities and services while emphasizing the densest population and activity centers in keeping with the requirements of the Growth Management Act.
- 4. **Connectivity:** Provide efficient connections between routes and modes.
- 5. **Congestion and Mobility:** Mitigate congestion on Interstate 5 and other high-use facilities throughout the county.
- 6. **Land Use:** Where appropriate, reflect the comprehensive plans of the appropriate jurisdiction and of Whatcom County by encouraging land use types, mixes and densities that promote balanced and effective transportation systems.
- 7. **Environmental Justice:** The environmental review process for transportation plans and projects shall adequately address the potential significant adverse effects of such actions on low-income, disability and minority populations.
- 8. **Alternative Forms of Transportation:** Ensure that alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles are seriously considered in the development of member jurisdictions' transportation elements.
- 9. **Health:** Increase bicycle and pedestrian travel by providing safe and convenient routes, bicycle parking, and educational efforts.
- 10. **Public Participation:** Engage the region's residents early during transportation planning processes.
- 11. **Least-Cost Planning:** Consider all of the resource costs associated with alternative and traditional investments, and provide information relevant to transportation decisions.
- 12. Transportation Demand Management:
 - o Develop strategies that remove barriers preventing people form using transportation alternatives.
 - o Reduce reliance and emphasis on single-occupant vehicles.
- 13. **Commute Trip Reduction:** Extend the free employer services to a large number of small businesses that are interested in hosting a program for their employees but are unable to fulfill the required duties of Commute Trip Reduction employers.
- 14. Other Transportation Modes: Provide appropriate access, networks and policy treatments for these travel methods.

(Whatcom Transportation Plan: A Combined Metropolitan and Regional Plan, pp. 53-59)

Investment Strategies and Priorities

The WTP is to be implemented by the County and local jurisdictions through their transportation programs in a way that is consistent with one another and with Countywide Planning Policies adopted by the Whatcom County Council, and supportive of regional goals. (WTP, p. 60) The WCOG also will provide assistance to local jurisdictions in integrating the WTP's policies into their respective comprehensive plans. (WTP, p. 91)

The Financial Planning Considerations chapter of the WTP sets out three priorities for investment:

- **Maintenance** of the existing system.
- **Preservation** to prolong the life of the existing system and protect the investments already made.
- **Improvements** to provide an adequate level of safety and regional mobility for the anticipated growth in travel demand. These projects are to meet three goals:
 - o Provide mobility and accessibility.

- o Select cost-effective and affordable projects.
- o Minimize environmental impact and improve air quality.

(WTP, pp. 101 and 102)

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

The WTP was developed by the WCOG Transportation Technical Advisory Committee, which is made up of planning and engineering representatives from jurisdictions in the county, and from the Whatcom Transportation Authority, the Port of Bellingham and WSDOT. As part of this effort, the transportation plans and forecasts of central Puget Sound to the south and British Columbia, Canada, to the north were considered, since these two large, urban areas have a significant impact on Whatcom County. The plan was reviewed and adopted by the RTPO Policy Board of elected officials from local jurisdictions. The Policy Board is responsible for developing policy guidance for the region.

In addition, there were several opportunities and forums for public participation. A Whatcom Transportation Task Force was assembled and met five times. The task force consisted of 23 mostly private sector members representing a wide variety of interests. They identified high-profile issues and areas of public concern, and reviewed draft plans. The general public was invited to comment on the plan through a survey, newsletter mailings, newspaper notices, a Web site and a public hearing.

Since new data, forecasts, and models were expected to come out from state and federal sources in the next two years, the RTPO planed to amend the WTP in approximately two years to make use of that information.

Least-Cost Planning

Least-cost planning is one of the 14 goals of the WTP. The plan notes that the state guidelines for least-cost planning had not yet been completed, and that these principles would be incorporated into the next update to the WTP. That said, the plan notes that the general principles of least-cost planning were applied in the development of the current WTP.

The WTP goal for least-cost planning is Goal 11 above. There are two policies associated with this goal:

- The Council of Governments shall work with member jurisdictions to identify alternative funding sources (including state and federal sources) for transportation projects that reduce the funding burden on the local community.
- Preservation through improvement of existing transportation systems should be given priority over building new facilities in the region. (WTP, p. 57)

14. Yakima Valley Council of Governments

Overview

The Yakima Valley Conference of Governments adopted the *Yakima Valley Metropolitan and Regional Transportation Plan*, 2003-2023, on April 16, 2003. The purpose of the plan is to guide multimodal transportation planning and programming decisions in the region by integrating both metropolitan and regional planning. The plan identifies issues and trends affecting transportation,

and provides transportation goals and objectives, solutions, a financial plan, and strategies and performance measures. (http://www.yvcog.org/current.htm)

Goals

The overall goals of the plan are to:

- Create and maintain a regional transportation system;
- Provide access to a range of goods, services, facilities, employment opportunities, and developable lands in a safe, convenient, and energy efficient manner; and
- Minimize impact on the environment and support alternatives for actions that improve regional air quality.

(Yakima Valley Conference of Governments, Yakima Valley Metropolitan and Regional Transportation Plan 2003-2023, p. 57)

The plan spells out 15 transportation goals and objectives for each.

- 1. **Cooperation** Make transportation investment decisions through a coordinated, cooperative and continuous process among jurisdictions.
- 2. **Economic Vitality** Support a vital and integrated economy for the region.
- 3. **Quality of Life** Enhance the overall livability of the region and produce an environment conducive to economic vitality.
- 4. **The Environment** Safeguard the region's environmental assets.
- 5. **Multimodal Transportation** Enhance all transportation modes, including non-motorized modes, to produce an efficient, effective and integrated system.
- 6. **Public Transportation** Provide all citizens with access to a complete system of affordable public transportation.
- 7. **Freight Mobility** Support reliable freight movement in the region, and use transportation investment decisions to support regional and state trade advantages.
- 8. **Aviation** Support airport development as a shipping hub integrated with the greater Puget Sound's international and domestic transportation network.
- 9. **Rail Transportation** Encourage development and use of freight and passenger rail services as an intermodal option.
- 10. **Bike and Pedestrian System** Support the establishment, preservation and maintenance of commuter and recreational bike routes, pedestrian paths and equestrian trails.
- 11. **Road System Operation and Maintenance** Ensure that the transportation system operates effectively, efficiently and predictably.
- 12. **Regional Vision** Encourage strategic thinking and a regional perspective among jurisdictions, agencies, regional organizations and tribal government.
- 13. **Concurrency** Ensure that transportation projects support the adopted levels of service in the growth management plans.
- 14. **Consistency** Foster an ongoing transportation planning and decision-making process to plan for improvement of the regional transportation system and facilities.
- 15. **Public Participation** Involve the public early and often in the planning process. (Yakima Valley RTP, pp. 58-68)

Investment Strategy and Priorities

The plan identifies transportation strategies to achieve the long-term transportation goals. The strategies aim to identify transportation modes and recommend ways to enhance each mode,

maximize and increase efficient connections between modes, and promote transportation demand management.

Transportation Strategies:

- 1. **Urbanization** Direct urban development first to areas supplied with government services or infrastructure, then to designated urban growth areas.
- 2. **Rural Development** In making development decisions, consider the availability of services and the carrying capacity of the land.
- 3. **Resource Lands** Maintain and enhance productive resource lands and discourage incompatible land uses.
- 4. **Transportation and Economic Vitality** Meet the transportation infrastructure needs of the region's major sources of economic growth and vitality by supporting movement that helps generate income for the region's principal industries.
- 5. **Land Use and Transportation** Support the coordination of land use and transportation decisions.
- 6. **Coordination** Improve multi-jurisdictional coordination to avoid transportation system deficiencies.

(Yakima Valley RTP, pp. 78-80)

Process for Setting and Revising Priorities

The process for developing the Regional Transportation Plan involved discussions with public officials, public agencies, special interest groups, community groups, private transportation providers, and private citizens. A section of the plan is devoted to the Yakama Nation's transportation and economic development needs and interests.

To develop the project list, information was gathered from local jurisdictions, community visioning meetings, and local groups. The list was then prioritized by elected officials and public works directors into three planning horizons: current (2003-08), mid-range (2009-14) and long-range (2015-23). The current plan includes only the projects that fell within the current planning horizon and were considered high priority. The projects in the other planning horizons are maintained in a database by the Yakima Valley Conference of Governments.

Appendix G

Best Practice Review: Performance Measurement in Other States

| | Page |
|------------|-------|
| Florida | A-42 |
| Kentucky | A-57 |
| Maryland | A-62 |
| Michigan | A-64 |
| Minnesota | A-67 |
| Missouri | A-77 |
| New Mexico | A-89 |
| Ohio | A-94 |
| Oregon | A-99 |
| Virginia | A-103 |

Florida

| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| 339.155 Florida | 2020: "a plan for all of Florida, not just the Florida | Mission: The Department will provide a safe transportation |
| Transportation Plan | Dept. of Transportation" | system that ensures the mobility of people and goods, |
| • "designed so as to be | A. Safe Transportation: Long Range Objectives | enhances economic prosperity and preserves the quality of |
| easily read and | (pg 2) | our environment and communities. |
| understood by the | Reduce the rate of motor vehicle, bicycle and | Vision: The people of DOTdedicated to making travel in |
| general public" | pedestrian fatalities. | Florida safer and more efficient. |
| • 20 year – 5 year updates | Improve the safety of highway/railroad | Values: |
| Annual perf. report | crossings and other locations where modes | Integrity – We are committed to honesty, loyalty and a high |
| Plan to allow | intersect. | standard of ethical conduct. |
| consideration of projects | Improve the safety of commercial vehicle | Excellence – We achieve performance excellence through |
| and strategies that will: | operations. | hard work, innovation, creativity and prudent risk taking. |
| (a) Support the | Improve the safety of seaport, rail and public | Respect – We value diversity, talent and ideas. We believe |
| economic vitality of | airport facilities. | every individual should contribute and have the opportunity |
| the US, Florida, and | Improve the safety of services, vehicles and | to be heard. |
| the metropolitan | facilities for transit, and for the transportation | Teamwork – We accomplish our goals by working together |
| areas by enabling | disadvantaged. | and relying on each other. |
| global | Minimize response times of each entity | Short-range component: FDOT has "established three |
| competitiveness, | responsible for responding to crashes and | strategic goals to implement the 2020 FTP" (pg 9) |
| productivity, and | other incidents. | Goal 1: Preserve and Manage a Safe, Efficient |
| efficiency; | Implement hurricane response and evacuation | Transportation System (pp 13-24) |
| (b) Increase the safety | plans in cooperation with emergency | 1.1 Through 2011, ensure that 80% of pavement on the State |
| and security of the | management agencies. | Highway System meets Department standards. |
| transportation | B. System Management: Long Range Objectives | 1.2 Through 2011, ensure that 90% of FDOT-maintained |
| system for motorized | (pg 4) | bridges meet Department standards while keeping all |
| and non-motorized | Adequately maintain all elements of the | FDOT-maintained bridges open to the public safe. |
| users; | transportation system to protect the public's | 1.3 Through 2011, achieve 100% of the acceptable maintain |
| (c) Increase the | investment for the future | standard on the State Highway System. |
| accessibility and | Increase the efficiency of the transportation | 1.4 By 2011, improve system efficiency by deploying |
| mobility options | system using appropriate technologies | Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology |
| available to people | Reduce the number of commercial vehicles | critical state corridors. |
| and for freight; | that illegally exceed weight limits on | 1.5 By 2011, improve safety and traffic flow by reducing the |
| (d) Protect and enhance | Florida's public roads and bridges | number of commercial vehicles crashes on the State |
| the environment, | Manage access on Florida's public roads to | Highway System to or below 7.7 per 100 million |
| promote energy | preserve capacity and enhance safety and | vehicles miles traveled. |
| conservation, and | mobility | Goal 2: Enhance Florida's economic competitiveness, |

| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| improve quality of | Improve incident management to minimize | quality of life and transportation safety (pp 25-49) | | |
| life; | the impact on traffic flow. | 2.1 Through 2011, at a minimum, maintain the rate of | | |
| (e) Enhance the | C. Economic Competitiveness: L-R Objectives | change in person hours of delay on the Florida Intrastate | | |
| integration and | (pg 6) | Highway System (FIHS). | | |
| connectivity of the | Establish, construct and manage Florida's | 2.2 By 2015, allocate 75% of discretionary capacity funds to | | |
| transportation | Strategic Intermodal System | the SIS. | | |
| system, across and | Provide for smooth and efficient transfers for | 2.3 By 2011, increase transit ridership at twice the average | | |
| between modes | both passengers and freight between seaports, | rate of population growth. | | |
| throughout Florida, | airports, railroads, highways and other | 2.4 By 2011, reduce the highway fatality rate on all public | | |
| for people and | elements of the strategic intermodal system. | roads to or below 1.3 fatalities per 100 million vehicle | | |
| freight; | Reduce delay for people and goods movement | miles traveled. | | |
| (f) Promote efficient | through increased system efficiency and | 2.5 By 2011, reduce the highway fatality rate on the State | | |
| system management | multimodal capacity. | Highway System to or below 1.5 fatalities per 100 | | |
| and operation; and | D. Quality of life: Long Range Objectives (pg 8) | million vehicles miles traveled. | | |
| (g) Emphasize the | Design the transportation system to support | 2.6 By 2011, reduce the bicyclist fatality rate to or below .19 | | |
| preservation of the | communities' visions, compatible with | fatalities per 100,000 population. | | |
| existing transport | corridors of regional and statewide | 2.7 By 2011, reduce the pedestrian fatality rate to or below | | |
| system. | significance. | .35 fatalities per 100,000 population. | | |
| 334.046 FDOT mission | Design the transportation system to include | Goal 3: Organizational Excellence (pp 51-62) | | |
| and goals: | human scale, pedestrian, transit-oriented and | 3.1 Improve external customer service | | |
| (a) Preservation | other community-enhancing features, where | 3.2 Improve response to external customer issues | | |
| Protecting the state's | appropriate. | 3.3 Improve project delivery | | |
| transportation infrastructure | • Design the transportation system in a way that | 3.4 Implement the Strategic Highway Safety Plan | | |
| investment: | sustains human and natural environments and | 3.5 Implement the DOT Business Model statewide | | |
| 1. 80 % pavement meets | conserves non-renewal resources. | 3.6 Improve the leadership effectiveness system | | |
| dept. standards; | Increase access to and use of alternatives to | 3.7 Address workforce development issues | | |
| 2. 90% of dept. maintained | the single-occupant vehicle. | 3.8 Improve the effectiveness of communication to all levels | | |
| bridges meet dept. standard; | Enhance the availability of transportation | of the organization | | |
| 3. 100% acceptable | services to persons who are transportation | | | |
| maintenance standard | disadvantages, and ensure the efficiency, | | | |
| (b) Economic | effectiveness and quality of those services. | | | |
| competitiveness; macro- | Ensure that the transportation decision- | | | |
| analysis link to econ. dev. | making process is accessible and fair for all | | | |
| (c) <i>Mobility</i> : state-wide cost | communities and citizens of Florida. | | | |
| effective linked system | | | | |

Florida Performance Reporting 2004-05 Short-Range Component & Annual Performance Report

Includes Executive Summary, About Transportation Planning Section, Glossary

Goal 1: Preserve and Manage a Safe, Efficient Transportation:

A. Focus Areas: System Preservation/System Efficiency

Related 2020 FTP Goals and Objectives

Goal: Preservation and management of Florida's transportation system LRO: Adequately maintain all elements of the transportation system to protect the public's investment for the future.

1. System Preservation

- a. Pavement Condition
 - 1. Lead Programs

Resurfacing

Motor Carrier Compliance

Preliminary Engineering

- 2. Strategies
 - Resurface 2,200 lane miles annually, and resurface 5.8% of the State Highway System annually beginning in FY 2002/03, increasing to 5.9% in 2005/06.
 - Reduce the % of commercial motor vehicles that exceed legal axle weight limits.
 - Facilitate training and technical assistance, and maintain current data systems to assist local governments in conducing pavement condition surveys and ratings.

3. Measures of Effectiveness

% turnpike meeting Dept. standards

% interstate pavement meeting Dept. std

% arterials meeting Dept. standards

Lane miles contracted for resurfacing

commercial vehicle weighings

portable scale weighings performed

% of commercial vehicles overweight

b. Bridge Conditions

1. Lead Programs

Bridge

Preliminary Engineering

Routine Maintenance

Motor Carrier Compliance

2. Strategies

- Program funds to replace or repair FDOT-maintained bridges with 12 months of deficiency identification.
- Replace or repair all structurally deficient FDOT-maintained bridges and bridges posted for weight restriction within six years of deficiency identification.

- Replace all other FDOT-maintained bridges designated for replacement within nine years of deficiency identification.
- Reduce the % of commercial motor vehicles exceeding the legal axle weight limits.
- Continue to monitor bridges scheduled to be replaced and make interim repairs, if necessary, to safeguard the traveling public.
- 3. Measures of Effectiveness
 - # of bridge inspections
 - # of bridges contracted for repair
 - # of bridges contracted for replacement
- c. Roadway maintenance lead program
 - 1. Lead Programs

Routine maintenance

- 2. Strategies
 - Continue to identify and implement practices that reduce the time and cost of preserving the State Highway System.
 - Continue to explore the use of innovative contracting methods to deliver the Roadway Maintenance program.
 - Take advantage of new technology and materials to provide better efficiency and quality.
 - Continue to monitor and adjust maintenance standards to preserve our investment and provide safe roadways for Florida motorists, including special population groups.
- 3. Measures of Effectiveness

Lane miles maintained

2. System Efficiency

- a. System Operations
 - 1. Lead Programs

Interstate Highway

Other Arterials

Preliminary Engineering

Routine Maintenance

Traffic Engineering

Planning

Toll Operations

Transit/Safety

- 2. Strategies
 - Incorporate ITS techniques such as traffic control systems and aggressive incident management techniques to keep traffic moving on the FIHS.
 - Improve the FIHS to incorporate high-occupancy vehicle lanes and express bus transit.
 - Expand the use of the electronic toll collection system known as SunPass.
 - Develop ITS consistent with Ten-Year ITS Cost Feasible Plan.
 - Support commuter assistance programs providing commuter options for sharing rides to work.

- Ensure appropriate facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists and buses are included in highway improvement projects, and work with communities on promotional and educational events to encourage the use of bicycles.
- Continue the Department's Access Management Program.
- Retrofit or eliminate at least 10 centerline miles of two-way left turn lanes or painted traffic separators statewide per year, targeting those with the highest potential for safety benefits.
- Eliminate or retrofit median openings, targeting those closest to intersections and others with the highest potential for safety benefits, through specific access management projects or as part of Resurfacing, Restoration and Rehabilitation (RRR) projects.
- Train additional Department and local government engineers, planners, and others making access management decisions on the safety benefits of access management projects and the use of two-way left turn lanes.
- Provide technical and financial assistance to transit agencies implementing Advance Public Transit Systems (APTS).

3. Measures of Effectiveness

Projects with traffic operations (ITS/demand management/access management) provided

b. Incident & emergency management

1. Lead Programs

Routine maintenance

Traffic engineering

Motor carrier compliance

Safety

2. Strategies

- Improve commercial motor vehicles safety by conducting safety inspections and enforcement of safety requirements for commercial vehicles; install inspection pits at weigh stations; and improve the out-ofservice verification program.
- Implement an enforcement program for holidays to create voluntary compliance through visibility and stringent enforcement.
- Use information from post-crash inspections of fatal crashes involving commercial vehicles to target resources in high crash locations and to identify problem carriers.
- Participate in public information safety programs targeted to both the general public and the industry.
- Support the ASHTO Anti-Terrorism Taskforce and the Florida Regional Domestic Security task forces.
- Coordinate with the Florida Highway Patrol, Florida Department of Law Enforcement, and the Florida Division of Emergency Management in revising the regional evacuation plans.
- Develop and implement comprehensive emergency management plans.

3. Measures of Effectiveness

Commercial motor vehicle crashes/100 million VMT

of commercial motor vehicle safety inspections

Goal 2: Enhance Florida's economic competitiveness, quality of life and transportation safety

A. Focus Areas: Mobility & Economic Competitiveness/Quality of Life/Safety

Related 2020 FTP Goals and Objectives

Goal: A transportation system that enhances Florida's economic competitiveness

LRO: -Establish, construct and manage Florida's Strategic Intermodal System

-Provide for smooth and efficient transfers of both passengers and freight between seaports, airports, railroads, highways and other elements of the Strategic Intermodal System

-Reduce delay for people and goods movement through increased system efficiency and multimodal capacity.

Goal: A transportation system that enhances Florida's quality of life

LRO: -Design the transportation system to support communities' visions, compatible with corridors of regional and statewide significance

-Design the transportation system to include human scale, pedestrian, bicycle, transit-oriented and other community-enhancing features, where appropriate

-Increase access to and use of alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle

-Enhance the availability of transportation services to persons who are transportation disadvantages, and ensure the efficiency, effectiveness and quality of those services

Goal: Safe transportation for residents, visitors and commerce.

LRO: -Reduce the rate of motor vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian fatalities.

-Improve the safety of highway/railroad crossings and other locations where modes intersect.

-Improve the safety of commercial vehicle operations

-Improve the safety of seaport, rail and public airport facilities

Improve the safety of services, vehicles and facilities for transit, and for the transportation disadvantaged.

Focus Area 1. Mobility/economic competitiveness

- a. Strategic Intermodal System
 - 1. Lead Programs

Planning

SIS/Intrastate Highways

Right of Way

Traffic Engineering

Toll Engineering

Toll Operations

Aviation

Rail

Seaports

Intermodal Access

Planning

- 2. Strategies
 - Complete development of a strategic plan for funding, managing and operating the designated Strategic Intermodal System.

- Implement a coordinated intermodal planning approach to better support Florida's economy while continuing to identify port, airport, rail, transit and paratransit infrastructure needs.
- Improve ground access routes to major intermodal facilities, freight distribution centers and military installations and spaceports.
- Work with our partners to anticipate possible effects of international policies that have an impact on travel and trade, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement.
- Transition towards an allocation of 75% of discretionary capacity funds to the SIS.

3. Measures of Effectiveness

Being developed

b. Intrastate Highway System

1. Lead Programs

Intrastate Highways

Right of Way

Traffic Engineering

Intermodal Access

Toll Operations

2. Strategies

- Continue to update on a regular basis and implement the FIHS needs and cost-feasible plans, while working with our partners to develop multimodal FIHS corridor plans.
- Maintain mobility on the FIHS by adding capacity, eliminating bottlenecks at interchanges/intersections, implementing traffic operations improvements, improving intermodal connections and encouraging increased use of alternatives to single-occupant vehicle travel.
- Work with our partners to identify locations where solutions to mobility problems include alternatives to added lanes.
- Coordinate with our partners to consider the impact of land-use decisions in the vicinity of FIHS corridors; to encourage multimodal and other corridor designations in local government comprehensive plans; to encourage the development of alternative parallel facilities; and to develop strategies to fund transportation alternatives.
- Continue to develop a system to monitor performance of the FIHS and the delivery of the 10 year cost-feasible plan.
- Expand the use of the electronic toll collection system know as SunPass.
- Improve ground access routes to major intermodal facilities, freight distribution centers consistent with the SIS Plan.

3. Measures of Effectiveness

Daily person hours of delay on FIHS

Vehicle miles traveled on FIHS

Lane miles of FIHS

of lane miles contracted for highway capacity improvements

Right of way parcels acquired

Toll transactions

Operational cost/toll

Operational cost/dollar collected

Total budget for intrastate highway construction & arterial highway construction divided by # of lane miles let to contract

c. Transportation Choices

1. Lead Programs

Aviation

Transit

Rail

Intermodal Access

Seaport Development

Transportation Disadvantaged

2. Strategies

- Implement the Strategic Intermodal System Plan.
- Increase the state's emphasis on regional travel.
- Implement the Department's statewide transit plan.
- Encourage and assist local governments to provide bicyclist and pedestrian facilities which can provide transit linkages and to facilitate the transport of bicycles on buses and trains.
- Encouraging MPO and local government support for the Governor's *Communities for A Lifetime* in planning senior friendly communities.
- Identify high pedestrian and bicycle crash corridors and develop corrective measures in the "3-E" areas (engineering, enforcement, education)
- Identify pedestrian/bicycle facility deficiencies (gaps) and develop projects to correct them.
- Implement a comprehensive pedestrian and bicycle traffic safety education component in at least three elementary and/or middle schools per year in each district.
- Continue to support and encourage the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged and local partners to continue transportation disadvantaged services and maximize limited resources.
- Support regional commuter assistance programs.
- Encourage the use of transportation demand management techniques such as car pooling, flexible work schedules, regional commuter assistance programs, trip reduction ordinances, congestion pricing and increased accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists.

3. Measures of Effectiveness

of one-way public transit passenger trips

of one-way trips provided for transportation disadvantaged

Average cost per requested one-way trip for transportation disadvantaged

of plane enplanements

of cruise disembarkations & disembarkations at Florida ports

Aviation projects

Rail projects

Intermodal projects

Seaport projects

Focus Area 2. Quality of Life

- a. Public Involvement
 - 1. Lead Programs

Planning

Environmental Management Office

Public Transportation

Preliminary Engineering

- 2. Strategies for Public Involvement
 - Continue to enhance Florida's transportation planning and programming processes, including provisions for extensive public involvement.
 - Provide public involvement opportunities to all interested parties and expand the use of cost-effective techniques such as participation at partners' regularly scheduled meetings, Web site, and ongoing relationships with groups and associations.
 - Develop methods of measuring the effectiveness of public involvement programs and processes.
 - Work with Metropolitan Planning Organizations to implement Community Impact Assessment principles and practices in the transportation planning process.
 - Develop methods to educate the public about transportation planning
- 3. Measures of Effectiveness (none listed)
- b. Transportation System Design: Balancing Mobility and Livability & the Natural Environment
 - 1. Lead Programs

Planning

Environmental Management

Preliminary Engineering

2. Strategies:

Balancing Mobility and Livability

- Continue to work with the MPOs and federal and state resource agencies to implement the ETDM process.
- Consider implementing livable communities features where appropriate.
- Coordinate land use and urban design in the development of transportation facilities.
- Work with the MPOs and local governments to plan and program appropriate roadway, bicycle and pedestrian connections projects.

Natural Environment

- Increase the use of wetland and wildlife mitigation banks to enhance the surrounding ecosystem (where mitigation is required) and continue to use wetland and wildlife conservation banks that are compatible with state plans.
- Continue to identify, prioritize and construct wildlife crossings that encourage safer wildlife movement in public areas managed for such purposes.

- Identify and implement appropriate roadside management techniques that reduce maintenance costs and implement ecosystem management principles.
- Continue to assist in implementing regional mitigation programs of Water Management Districts, Florida's Conservation and Recreational Lands Program, Ecosystem Management Program, and Greenways Program, including the statewide Greenways System Plan, early in project development phase.
- Help ensure that all air quality standards related to mobile source emissions are met, address air quality on a regional basis, and assist MPOs in meeting conformity requirements.
- 3. Measures of Effectiveness (none listed)

Focus Area 3. Safety

- a. Highway-Related Safety
 - 1. Lead Programs

Safety

Preliminary Engineering

Planning

Routine Maintenance

Traffic Engineering

- 2. Strategies
 - Identify locations having significant crash trends leaving the normal path of travel and develop and implement comprehensive countermeasures in the "3-E" areas (engineering, enforcement and education) at these locations.
 - Identify locations on planned projects that have roadway characteristics similar to those in the strategies above and develop proactive countermeasures in the "3-E" areas of engineering, enforcement and education, to be implemented in the projects.
 - Establish an incentive program to improve roadside safety on local roadways, including the selection, installation and maintenance of upgraded roadside safety hardware at selected locations.
 - Identify, acquire, and implement technologies available to collect, analyze and disseminate traffic safety data in a timely and accurate manner.
 - Create a statewide compatible system of traffic safety data that is efficient and reliable for both internal and external stakeholders.
 - Maintain Internet web page to inform stakeholders of research and other projects underway that affect traffic safety for interested parties to learn of the development of new methodologies and review interim and final results/recommendations.
 - Continue to identify, address, coordinate and implement highway safety activities in the areas of: community traffic safety teams; alcohol/drug programs; safety belt and child restraint programs; motorcycle, pedestrian and bicycle safety; public education; rail-highway grade crossing safety; speed and aggressive driving

programs; work zone safety; elder drivers, and commercial motor carriers, as well as improve the consideration of safety during planning, design and construction of projects.

- Develop and implement improvement projects at 20 additional highcrash intersections (signalized and un-signalized) per district over the next 5 years.
- Improve the ability to enforce violations at high-crash intersections by using red light enforcement lights and other innovative techniques.
- Develop and deliver an intersection safety education program for the public.
- Enhance work zone safety by better informing motorists of hazards and by providing additional worker protection.
- Identify high pedestrian and bicycle crash corridors and develop corrective measures in the "3-E" areas.
- Identify pedestrian-bicycle facility deficiencies (gaps) and develop projects to correct them.
- Conduct training on accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians in the design process.
- 3) Measures of Effectiveness

Fatalities per 100 million VMT on all public roads

Fatalities per 100 million VMT on the State Highway System

Bicycle fatalities per 100,000 population

Pedestrian fatalities per 100,000 population

- b. Safety of Seaport, Rail and Public Airport Facilities
 - 1. Lead Programs

Safety

Seaports

Aviation

Rail

- 2. Strategies
 - Continue to conduct public education campaigns for awareness of rail-highway crossing safety.
 - Conduct research into innovative highway safety devices, including those which prohibit motorists from driving around rail-highway crossing protection systems, and work with appropriate agencies to incorporate research results into program development.
 - Identify hazardous roadway locations and features, including those at rail-highway crossings, and establish priorities to correct them.
- 3. Measures of Effectiveness (none provided)

Goal 3: Organizational Excellence

A. Focus Areas: Customers/Work Program/Organizational Performance

Related 2020 FTP Goals and Objectives: All

Focus Area 1: Customers

- a. Customer Satisfaction & Issues
 - 1. Lead Programs

Administration

Construction Engineering Inspection

Materials and Research

Motor Carrier Compliance

Planning

Preliminary Engineering

Public Transportation Operations

Right-of-Way Support

Routine Maintenance

Safety

Toll Operations

Traffic Engineering

2. Strategies

- Evaluate customer satisfaction through biennial surveys to identify customer needs and expectations.
- Develop action plans for targeted issues identified statewide and in each District.
- Aggregate and analyze customer complaints, determine root causes and corrective actions that can lead to the elimination of most complaints.
- 3. Measures of Effectiveness
 - % of external customer satisfaction
 - % customers satisfied with local input on design
 - % customers satisfied with access to business
 - % customers satisfied with timeliness of completing construction

Total customer issues tracked

% issues resolved with 10 working days

Focus Area 2: Work Program

- a. Customer Satisfaction & Issues
 - 1. Lead Programs

Administration

Construction Engineering Inspection

Materials and Research

Motor Carrier Compliance

Planning

Preliminary Engineering

Public Transportation Operations

Right-of-Way Support

Routine Maintenance

Safety

Toll Operations

Traffic Engineering

- 2. Strategies
 - Ensure adequate production efforts to meet scheduled contract letting targets.
 - Complete construction projects on time and within budget.

- Identify and resolve issues that could delay project implementation early in the planning and project development processes.
- Ensure the timely, cost-effective development and implementation of quality work programs.
- Maintain information systems that assist in delivering the work program.
- Support Computer Assisted Drafting and Design (CADD) Systems.
- 3. Measures of Effectiveness

% increase in # of days required for completed construction contracts over original contract days (less weather days)

% increase in final amount paid for completed construction contracts over original contract amount

% of construction contracts planned for letting that were actually let

of projects certified ready for construction

Projects with right-of-way support provided.

b. Highway Safety

1. Lead Programs

Administration

Construction Engineering Inspection

Materials and Research

Motor Carrier Compliance

Planning

Preliminary Engineering

Design

Public Transportation Operations

Right-of-Way Support

Routine Maintenance

Safety

Toll Operations

- 2. Strategies
 - Work with our partners to identify the causes of crashes and develop appropriate countermeasures.
 - Continue implementation of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan.
- 3. Measures of Effectiveness: (This section deals with how to provide a safe system. Measures are not repeated from first two goals.)

Focus Area 3: Organizational Performance

- a. DOT Business Model
 - 1. Lead Programs

Administration

Construction Engineering Inspection

Materials and Research

Motor Carrier Compliance

Planning

Preliminary Engineering

Public Transportation Operations

Right-of-Way Support

Routine Maintenance

Safety

Toll Operations

Traffic Engineering

2. Strategies

- Continue to develop and refine "core process" initiatives to support a results based management system.
- Monitor the results of "core process" activities to identify the need for improvements that can strengthen their efficiency and effectiveness.
- Continue to develop and refine performance measures that create and balance value for all customers.
- Employ technological tools that provide management with readily available information on key performance measures to support decision making.
- Continue and expand the implementation of the tiered business plan.

3. Measures of Effectiveness

% of core processes with control systems operational

of key sub processes with control systems operational

of key performance measures defined within the monitoring system

% of key performance measures monitored by automated information system

% of Tier 2 plans in place and being monitored and measured.

% of Tier 3 plans in place and being monitored and measured.

b. Leadership Effectiveness System

1. Lead Programs

All Supervisors

- 2. Strategies
 - Continue review of Department performance and feedback from customers and employees to identify areas of improvement and specific actions to improve performance.
 - Serve as role models to employees.
- 3. Measures of Effectiveness

Score on leadership system questions from employee survey

Score on credibility questions on employee survey

c. Workforce Development Issues

1. Lead Programs

All Supervisors

- 2. Strategies
 - Conduct annual employee surveys to identify issues and areas that can be improved to increase employee productivity and satisfaction.
 - Fully implement People First, addressing issues of recruitment, selection and retention.
 - Establish benchmark practices in employee well-being, training and performance management.
- 3. Measures of Effectiveness
 - Satisfaction with employee pay
 - Satisfaction with employee recognition
 - Satisfaction with employee involvement

- Overall employee satisfaction
- d. Effectiveness of Communication to All Levels of the Organization
 - 1. Lead Programs

All Supervisors

- 2. Strategies
 - Implement Communications Policy and Guidelines
 - Implement Leadership Achieving New Heights procedure
 - Implement Communications Champions Action Plans adopted by the Executive Board in November 2003.
- 3. Measures of Effectiveness

Avg. score on communications items

Kentucky

| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| KRS 7A.120 State capital | 1999 Statewide Transportation Plan | 2003 The Path Year End Report | | |
| improvement plan | Four Goals (pp 1-7) | Vision: Working together to continually improve the | | |
| Required every six years, | 1) Preserve and manage the existing | transportation infrastructure in Kentucky. (pg 1) | | |
| including transportation | transportation infrastructure to ensure mobility | Mission: To provide a safe, efficient and | | |
| projects submitted by the | and access | environmentally sound transportation system for the | | |
| Kentucky Transportation | Maintain and/or upgrade the existing | movement of people and goods, thereby enhancing the | | |
| Board. | infrastructure to an acceptable level of service | quality of life and economic development in Kentucky. | | |
| | and manage the existing system to realize | (pg 1) | | |
| KRS 174.020 Creates | improved efficiencies. | Values: | | |
| Transportation Cabinet | 2) Support economic development by providing | Satisfying our customers | | |
| | system connectivity | • Leadership | | |
| KRS 176.419, 420, 430 | Enhance the connectivity of the individual | • Integrity | | |
| Requires six year road plan | modes with the business and economic centers | • The highest quality in all we do | | |
| listing individual projects. | of the state and improve the connectivity | Using taxpayer's money wisely | | |
| | between the modes both within the state and as | Measuring our results | | |
| | an integral part of the intermodal system for the | Continuous improvement and learning | | |
| | nation. | Employee participation | | |
| | 3) Strengthen customer relationships through | Development and opportunity | | |
| | coordination and cooperation in the | • Listening | | |
| | transportation planning process | • Systematic problem solving | | |
| | • Establish or improve relationships with the wide | Goals | | |
| | variety of local, regional and private interests, | 1. Manage Congestion (pg 23-68) | | |
| | striving to encourage the involvement of | a) Statewide maintenance rating program | | |
| | traditionally underserved communities, | b) Ride quality index | | |
| | particularly low-income and/or minority | c) Pavement preservation needs | | |
| | communities, involved in or affected by the transportation planning process. | d) % structurally deficient bridgese) % functionally obsolete bridges | | |
| | 4) Enhance transportation safety and convenience | e) % functionally obsolete bridgesf) Bridge sufficiency rates | | |
| | to ensure mobility and access | | | |
| | Improve the safety and convenience of | g) Access managementh) Work zone traffic control | | |
| | Kentucky's transportation system for the benefit | i) Project delivery | | |
| | of motorized and non-motorized users, serving | j) Public transportation ridership | | |
| | the mobility needs of both people and freight | k) Human service transportation delivery | | |
| | and improve the quality of life for Kentuckians. | 2. Improve Safety (pg 69-81) | | |
| | and improve the quanty of the for Kentuckians. | a) Fatality information | | |
| | <u> </u> | a) Palatity information | | |

| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT |
|-----------|---------------------|--|
| | | b) Run-off-road and crossover crashes |
| | | c) Intersection crashes |
| | | d) Pedestrian fatalities |
| | | e) Safety program |
| | | f) Commercial vehicle safety |
| | | g) OSHA Record Incident Rate |
| | | 3. Ensure Environmental Stewardship (pg 83-89) |
| | | a) Wetland banking |
| | | b) Relationship building |
| | | c) Context sensitive solutions |
| | | d) Crash rate comparison |
| | | e) Environmental impact study |
| | | f) Environmental assessment |
| | | g) Environmental tracking system |
| | | 3. Improve Organizational Performance (pg 91-120) |
| | | a) Customer satisfaction |
| | | b) Employee satisfaction |
| | | c) Employee suggestion program |
| | | d) Ensure our capability to respond to disaster |
| | | e) Attract, develop, involve and retain qualified |
| | | people |
| | | f) Information technology funding |
| | | g) Equal employment opportunities |
| | | |
| | | |

Kentucky Transportation Cabinet The Path 2003 Year End Report

Performance Measures:

1. Manage Congestion

- a. Statewide maintenance rating program
 - To achieve a Statewide Maintenance Rating Program score of 80 by June 30, 2006
 - Statewide MRP scores by type of road & attribute
- b. Ride quality index
 - To maintain minimal acceptable Ride Quality Index limits (Interstates = 3.25, Parkways = 3.25, MP System = 3.00, RS System = 2.75
 - Ride quality of pavements
 - Ride quality of pavements by district
 - Ride quality of new construction and overlays
- c. Pavement preservation needs
 - To reduce the % of miles of pavement in poor condition by 2% by June 30, 2004
 - Pavements in poor condition
- d. % structurally deficient bridges
 - To reduce the % of structurally deficient bridges each year
 - # of bridge/# & % structurally deficient
- e. % functionally obsolete bridges
 - To reduce the % of functionally obsolete bridges each year
 - % functionally obsolete bridges
 - % functionally obsolete bridges by district & system
- f. Bridge sufficiency rates
 - To reduce the number of bridges with a sufficiency rating below 30
 - Sufficiency rating between 50 & 30: State maintained and other maintained
 - Sufficient rating below 30: State maintained and other maintained
- g. Access management
 - Develop and implement access management related guidance by June 30, 2004
- h. Work zone traffic control
 - Document and showcase at least one innovative work zone traffic control project each year
- i. Project delivery
 - To maintain minimal acceptable project delivery requirements
 - % of projects on time all phases
 - % of projects let vs. planned
 - % within budget
- j. Public transportation ridership
 - To increase public ridership statewide by 2% of June 30, 2006
 - rural public & specialized transportation mileage
 - rural public transportation ridership statewide
 - specialized public transportation # of passenger

- k. Human service transportation delivery
 - To increase Human Service Transportation Delivery Program customer satisfaction by 3% of June 30, 2004
 - HSTC rider survey results
 - Average # of monthly trips per year

2. Improve Safety

- a) Fatality information
 - Reduce the # of highway-related fatalities
 - # of highway fatalities per 100 MVT
 - commercial vehicle related facilities
- b) Run-off-road and crossover crashes
 - Reduce run-off-road and crossover crashes by 10% by June 30, 2007
 - injury collision rate on state-maintained roadways
 - fatal collision rates on state-maintained roadways
 - collision rates on state-maintained roads by rural and urban
- c) Intersection crashes
 - Reduce intersection crashes by 10% by June 30, 2007
- d) Pedestrian fatalities
 - Reduce pedestrian fatalities by 10% by June 30, 2007
- e) Safety program
 - Develop Strategic Safety Programs at Area Development Districts by June 30, 2004
- f) Commercial vehicle safety
 - Increase Commercial Vehicle Safety
 - % of out-of-service vehicles
 - % of out-of-service drivers
 - hazardous materials safety inspections
 - portable weighs
- g) OSHA Record Incident Rate
 - Reduce OSHA Recordable Incident Rate to 5.0 by June 30, 2005
 - OSHA incident averages
 - Average OSHA recordable incident rate by district
 - Work-related injuries/illnesses vs. OSHA Recordable injuries/illness

3. Ensure Environmental Stewardship (pg 83-89)

- a) Wetland banking
 - Establish an Environmental Policy
 - # of acreage banked
 - average wetland loss/average wetland mitigation/average wetland mitigation ration/# of bank sites used
- b) Relationship building
 - Build relationships with other agencies
- c) Context sensitive solutions
 - Establish a system to document best practices of context sensitive solutions by June 30, 2003
- d) Crash rate comparison
 - Establish a system to compare crash rates of context sensitive solution projects to comparable non-context sensitive solution projects by June 30, 2003
- e) Environmental impact study

- Reduce the amount of time taken to complete an Environmental Impact Study to 36 months by June 30, 2007
- f) Environmental assessment
 - Reduce the amount of time taken to complete an Environmental Assessment to 12 months by June 30, 2007
- g) Environmental tracking system
 - Implement an environmental document tracking system by June 30, 2004

4. Improve Organizational Performance (pg 91-120)

- a. Customer satisfaction
 - Increase customer's overall satisfaction with highway system to 75% by June 30, 2005
 - % customer overall satisfaction with highway system
- b. Employee satisfaction
- Increase employee satisfaction
 - Average rating on employee survey
- c. Employee suggestion program
- Increase the dollar amount of savings identified through employee suggestions by 10% by June 30, 2004
 - \$ saved from employee suggestion
- d. Ensure our capability to respond to disaster
- Ensure our capability to respond to disaster
- e. Attract, develop, involve and retain qualified people
- Absenteeism measure: sick leave used/approved leave without pay used/unapproved leave without pay used
- Employee turnover rate: # of separations
- OSHA recordable injuries and lost workdays
- GAB (worker's compensation) billing
- First report of injury or illness claim
- f. Information technology funding
- Increase % of funding for the use of technology to 2.45% by June 30, 2005
- g. Equal employment opportunities
- Strong ethical standards
 - EEO employee yearly report (% of employees in employment categories)

| Maryland | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| State Law | Transportation Plan | State Department of Transportation | |
| Section 2-103.1 Defines: | Annual State Report on Transportation: Two | Mission: To facilitate the safe and efficient | |
| Capital project/Capital equipment/Construction | parts Maryland Transportation Plan and the | movement of people and goods across all | |
| phase/Major capital project/Minor capital | Consolidated Transportation Program. The | transportation modes. | |
| project/Project development phase/Significant | MTP is the Department's long range vision for | Vision: To provide a transportation system | |
| change | transportation in Maryland. It includes goals | that works for people. | |
| 1) Consolidated Transportation Program | and policies that have been embraced by the | Performance Measures – Implementing the | |
| Annual | Department to achieve the vision. The CTP | MTP and CTP (total of 25 performance | |
| List of program priorities | presents the detailed listings and descriptions of | measures) | |
| Statement of operating costs | the capital projects that are proposed for | Goal 1: Efficiency (pp 10-15) | |
| Descriptions of major capital projects | construction, or for development and | % of SHA-maintained roads with | |
| List of major capital projects – 6 years | evaluation during the next six-year period. | acceptable ride quality | |
| & revenue source & budget variances | After review submitted to the General | % of SHA and MdTA NHS bridges | |
| List minor capital projects – 6 years | Assembly each Jan. The third annual report is | meeting Federal structural standards | |
| List major bridge projects | a Performance Progress Report – Implementing | % of MTA service provided on time | |
| Summary capital & operating programs | the MTP & CTP | Average MVA branch customer visit | |
| • Revenues | 2004 Plan: Goals & Objectives | time | |
| • Glossary | Efficiency- Maximize the Effectiveness of | % of MVA transactions completed by | |
| • Cross-reference to information in the | Existing Systems (pp 5-6) | alternative services | |
| State Report on Transportation | Objectives | Reduction in incident congestion delay | |
| Bicycle and pedestrian information | Extend the useful life of existing | Goal 2: Mobility (pp 16-19) | |
| 2) Maryland Transportation Plan | facilities and equipment | % of lane miles with average annual | |
| • Every 5 years/20 year forecast | Maximize the operational | volumes below congested levels | |
| Be expressed in goals and objectives | performance and capacity of | Peak-period congestion of freeways in | |
| Summary of types of projects and | existing systems | the Baltimore and Washington regions | |
| programs using multi-modal approach | Mobility-Provide Critical New System | % of tolls collected electronically | |
| 3) Attainment of goals and benchmarks | Additions (pp 7-8) | Annual vehicles revenues miles of | |
| Annual report "on the attainment of | Objectives | MTA transit service provided | |
| transportation goals and benchmarks for | Relieve congestion by adding key | Goal 3: Safety & Security (pp 20-22) | |
| the approved and proposed MTP and | system links | # and rate of injuries on all Maryland | |
| the approved and proposed CTP." | Support varied modal needs with | roads | |
| Must include: | cost-effective options | # and rate of fatalities on all Maryland | |
| 1) Measurable performance indicators or | Safety and Security – Ensure Customer and | roads | |
| benchmarks, in priority funding areas, | Workforce Safety and Enhance System | • Customer perception of the safety of the | |
| designed to quantify the goals and | Security (pp 9-10) | MTA systems | |
| objectives specified in the MTP | Objectives | BWI compliance with FAA safety | |

| State Law | Transportation Plan | State Department of Transportation |
|---|---|--|
| The degree to which projects & programs in the MTP and CTP attain those goals and benchmarks as | Reduce injuries, fatalities and risks Ensure security of the public Productivity and Quality – Improve Program and Project Delivery (pp 11-12) Objectives Reduce project implementation time through process improvements Incorporate environmental stewardship into all projects and activities Contain costs and leverage resources with business-like organization and innovative approaches to funding and service delivery. | inspection Port compliance with the Maritime Transportation Security Act 2002 Goal 4: Productivity and Quality (pp 23-29) Transportation-related emissions by region More as "very good" or "outstanding" Customer satisfaction with MTA MVA customer service rating "good" or "very good" SHA maintenance expenditures per lane mile MVA cost per transaction MTA operating cost per passenger and per passenger mile BWI operating expense per enplaned passenger BWI revenue versus operating expense MPA revenue versus operating expense MPA revenue versus operating expense For each the report provides information on why performance changed and future performance strategies. |

Michigan

| Michigan | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT | | |
| Act 286 of 1964: | Five-Year Transportation Program, 2006 – 2010 is to be | Mission: to preserve, manage and fully integrate our | | |
| Establishes the State | presented for approval to the State Transportation | road system into the context of a 21 st century economy | | |
| Transportation Commission. | Commission on January 26, 2006. It implements the goals | and coordinate a multi-modal transportation system. | | |
| Act designates the following | and policies of the State Transportation Commission for: | (from the Five-Year Transportation Program, 2006- | | |
| planning responsibilities: | Preservation | 2010, p. 3) | | |
| Director of Transportation: | • Safety | Another version is on the MDOT Mission, Vision, | | |
| Authority includes to | Mobility | Values Web page: | | |
| "Establish a program of | The five-year program includes federal and state revenue | Mission: Providing the highest quality integrated | | |
| current and long-range | assumptions, investment strategies for highway and multi- | transportation services for economic benefit and | | |
| planning for the | modal programs statewide and by region, and strategies | improved quality of life. | | |
| transportation systems | for safety and security. | Vision: MDOT is committed to improving Michigan's | | |
| under the department's | 2005 – 2025 State Long-Range Plan: Mobility is | total transportation system by efficiently delivering | | |
| jurisdiction" | Security (Aug. 2002) | transportation products, services and information. | | |
| State Transportation | Transportation Goals: (pp. 12-13) | MDOT: | | |
| Commission: Duties | 1) Preservation | is aware of customer/stakeholder transportation wants | | |
| include "The | 2) Safety | and meets their needs. | | |
| establishment of | 3) Basic Mobility | partners with others. | | |
| transportation policies | 4) Strengthening the State's Economy | is continually getting better. | | |
| for the guidance and | 5) Transportation Services Coordination | is an effective and efficient | | |
| direction of the | 6) Intermodalism | Values: | | |
| director." | 7) Environment and Aesthetics | Quality: Achieving our best within our resources | | |
| | 8) Land Use Coordination | Teamwork: Effective involvement of people | | |
| Act 51 of 1951: created the | Transportation Strategies: (pp. 14-15) | Customer Orientation: Knowing our customers and | | |
| Michigan Transportation | 1) Asset Management | understanding their needs | | |
| Fund, and governs fuel and | 2) Corridors of Highest Significance | Integrity: Doing the right thing | | |
| motor vehicle taxes and the | 3) Congestion Management | Pride: In MDOT and the importance of our work | | |
| distribution of this revenue. | In addition to these three major strategies, the plan lists 41 | | | |
| | other strategies for future investment, ranging from winter | | | |
| Transportation Funding | maintenance, to carpool parking lot, to border security, to | | | |
| Study Committee | environmental justice. | | | |
| (2000) made 20 | Performance Monitoring (Indicators): | | | |
| recommendations "for | 1) System Condition (relates to Preservation goal): | | | |
| moving the management | a) Customer Satisfaction Survey | | | |
| and funding of our | b) Pavement/Runway Condition | | | |
| transportation system— | c) Bridge Condition | | | |

| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|
| the backbone of | d) Bus Fleet Condition | |
| Michigan's economy— | e) Intermodal Facility Condition | |
| into the 21 st century." | 2) Accessibility, Mobility and Safety (relates to goals of | |
| Key recommendations: | Basic Mobility, Intermodalism, Safety, and indirectly | |
| Use long-term, planned | to Strengthening the State's Economy): | |
| asset management on a | a) Customer Satisfaction Survey | |
| statewide basis. | b) Crash Rates and Trends | |
| Develop a strategic plan | c) Level of Service | |
| using the asset management | d) Portion of System with Seasonal Load Restrictions | |
| approach. | e) Percent of Population Served – Transit Ridership | |
| Technical Advisory Panel | f) Airports with Adequate Primary Runway System | |
| should select system | 3) Operational and Service (related to Transportation | |
| performance measures, | Services Coordination goal): | |
| along with associated | a) Customer Satisfaction Survey | |
| standards and criteria. | b) Level of Service | |
| The asset management | c) Percent of Population Served – Transit Ridership | |
| process should include | d) Number of Buses Eligible for Replacement and | |
| standards, criteria and | Percent Unfunded | |
| performance measures. | e) Passenger Terminals Served by Two or More Modes | |
| | f) Airports with All-Weather Access | |
| | (full Long-Range Plan, pp. 76-79) | |
| | Criteria to select the measures: (p. 76) | |
| | • The indicator measures an outcome related to one | |
| | or more of the state long-range plan goals. | |
| | Reliable information for this indicator is already | |
| | collected on a regular basis, or can be obtained at | |
| | reasonable cost. | |
| | The indicator and its relationship to the state long- | |
| | range plan are easily understood. | |
| | A nice table shows the relationship between performance | |
| | monitoring and the long-range goals. | |
| | An update to this plan, the 2005 – 2030 State Long- | |
| | Range Plan, is now in development. | |

Table 6-1 Relationship of Performance Monitoring to State Long Range Plan Goals

| | | 1 | | _ | | | T |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| Preservation | Safety | Basic Mobility | Strengthening the State's Economy | Transportation Service Coordination | Intermodalism | Environment & Aesthetics | Land Use Coordination |
| | | | | | | | |
| Н | н | н | L | н | Н | Н | L |
| Н | L | М | Н | L | M/H | M/H | L |
| Н | L | Н | Н | L | м/н | L | L |
| Н | М | М | Н | М | L | L | |
| Н | Н | М | Н | L | М | М | L |
| | | | | | | | |
| Н | Н | Н | L | H | Н | Н | L |
| М | Н | М | М | M | М | | М |
| | М | Н | Н | L | Н | | Н |
| М | L | М | Н | L | Н | | |
| М | | M/H | Н | Н | М | | Н |
| Н | M/H | М | Н | L | , r | М | Н |
| | | 40 | | | | | |
| Н | Н | н | L | Н | Н | Н | L |
| | М | Н | Н | L | Н | | Н |
| М | | M/H | Н | Н | М | | Н |
| М | L | М/Н | М | н | | | |
| L | М | М/Н | L | М | М | | М |
| М | M/H | Н | Н | М | Н | М | L |
| | H H H H M M M H | H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H | H H H H H M M H M H M M M M M M M M M M | M | M M | M M M M M H | H H H L H L M/H M/H H L M H L M/H L H M M H L M/H L H M M H L M M H H H H L M M M H H H H L H H M M H L H H M M H L H M M H L H M M H L H M M H L H M M H L H M M H L H M M H L H M M M H L H M M M H L H M M M M M M H M M H L H M M M M H L H M M M M H L H M M M M H L H M M M H L H M M H H L H M M H H L H M M H H L H M M H H L H M M H H L H M M H H L H M M H H L H M M H H L H M M H H L H M M H H L H M M H H L H M M H H L H M M H H L H M M M/H H H M M M M M H L M M/H M H L M M M H L M M/H M M H |

Notes: "H" indicates a high linkage "M" indicates a moderate linkage "L" indicates a low linkage

Minnesota

| State Law | Transportation Plan | | State DOT |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| 174.01 Creation; policy. | Mn/DOT's Stat | tewide Transportation Plan contains | 2003 Strategic Plan: Helping Minnesotans Travel |
| Policy Goals: | policies to impl | ement the strategic directions established | Safer, Smarter and More Efficiently Principles: |
| (1) to provide safe | in Mn/DOT's S | Strategic Plan revised in 2003. | Commitment to mission — We will focus on |
| transportation for users | Strategic Direc | ction/Plan Policies | what is important and do it well. |
| throughout the state; | Strategic Dire | ection A: Safeguard What Exists (pg 4) | Focus on customers — Our customers will be |
| (2) to provide multimodal | Policy 1: | Preserve Essential Elements of Existing | the center of every decision we make and every |
| and intermodal | - | Transportation System | service we provide. |
| transportation that enhances | Policy 2: | Support Land Use Decisions that | • Simplify government — Government will be |
| mobility and economic | | Preserve Mobility and Enhance the | reformed. Services will be improved. |
| development and provides | | Safety of Transportation Systems | Government will become more accountable. |
| access to all persons and | Policy 3: | Effectively Manage the Operation of | Manage for results — Develop challenging |
| businesses in Minnesota | | Existing Transportation Systems to | indicators and benchmarks for all levels of |
| while ensuring that there is | | Provide Maximum Service to Customers | government, measure results and |
| no undue burden placed on | | ction B: Make the Network Operate | use the outcomes to guide decisions and direct |
| any community; | Better (pg 4) | | our work. |
| (3) to provide a reasonable | | Provide Cost Effective Transportation | Improvement by innovation — We will |
| travel time for commuters; | | Options for People and Freight | encourage competition, collaboration, |
| (4) to provide for the | _ | Enhance Mobility in Interregional | privatization, out-sourcing and the increased use |
| economical, efficient, and | | Transportation Corridors Linking | of technology and e-government services to |
| safe movement of goods to | | Regional Trade Centers | improve the work we do. |
| and from markets by rail, | _ | Enhance Mobility within Regional Trade | Vision: A coordinated transportation network that meets |
| highway, and waterway; | | Centers | the needs of Minnesota's citizens and businesses for safe, |
| (5) to encourage tourism by | | Increase the Safety and Security of | timely and predictable travel. |
| providing appropriate | | Transportation Systems and Users | Mission: Improve access to markets, jobs, goods and |
| transportation to Minnesota | U | ction C: Make Mn/DOT Work Better | services and improve mobility by focusing on priority |
| facilities designed to attract | (pg 4) | | transportation improvements and investments that help |
| tourists; | _ | Continually Improve Mn/DOT's Internal | Minnesotans travel safer, smarter and more efficiently. |
| (6) to provide transit | | Management and Program Delivery | Strategic Directions: |
| services throughout the state | • | Inform, Involve and Educate All | Safeguard What Exists |
| to meet the needs of transit | | Potentially Affected Stakeholders in | Make the System Operate Better |
| users; | | Transportation Plans and Investment | Make Mn/DOT Work Better |
| (7) to promote productivity | | Decision Processes | Investment Options: |
| through system management | _ | Protect the Environment and Respect | Building More |
| and the utilization of | | Community Values | Address congestion, add highway capacity and |
| technological advancements | | | increase statewide mobility through investments |

| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| (8) to maximize the benefits | | to remove bottlenecks and improve the |
| received for each state | | performance of interregional highway corridors. |
| transportation investment; | | Support cost-effective investments in transit |
| (9) to provide funding for | | systems and in highway transit advantage |
| transportation that, at a | | projects. |
| minimum, preserves the | | Pursue long-range transportation funding policies |
| transportation infrastructure; | | and strategies that will reduce the state's |
| (10) to ensure that the | | significant backlog of critical highway and bridge |
| planning and | | construction and reconstruction projects, |
| implementation of all modes | | including "mega projects." |
| of transportation are | | Building Faster |
| consistent with the | | Accelerate construction of critical, long-delayed |
| environmental and energy | | state highway and bridge projects when funding |
| goals of the state; | | is made available. |
| (11) to increase high- | | Shorten the duration of highway and bridge |
| occupancy vehicle use; | | construction and reconstruction projects through |
| (12) to provide an air | | innovative project development, delivery, |
| transportation system | | construction and financing strategies, along with |
| sufficient to encourage | | streamlining government review, permitting and |
| economic growth and allow | | other processes. |
| all regions of the state the | | Accelerate funding for highway transit advantage |
| ability to participate in the | | capital improvements that will support and |
| global economy; | | encourage transit use in congested highway |
| (13) to increase transit use | | corridors. |
| in the urban areas by giving | | Moving Better |
| highest priority to the | | Focus the state's limited financial resources on |
| transportation modes with | | investments that improve travelers' safety, reduce |
| the greatest people moving | | traffic congestion, improve mobility in |
| capacity; and | | interregional corridors. |
| (14) to promote and increase | | • Strengthen cost-effective locally supported transit |
| bicycling as an energy- | | options. |
| efficient, nonpolluting, and | | Invest in major highway and transit projects that |
| healthful transportation | | move the most people and goods in the most cost- |
| alternative. | | effective manner to the destinations of choice |
| | | Source: MnDOT web page 2003 Strategic Plan) |

Minnesota Performance Reporting State Transportation Plan Chapter 6 Target Setting Framework, Performance Measures, Targets and Policy Guidance

Three types of measures:

- Mature measures: These are measures for which baseline data exists and policy targets have been in use previously
- Emerging measures: These are measures for which data exists, but targets have not been set previously
- Developmental measures: These are measures for which neither data nor targets were previously developed.

Mn/DOT has a varying degree of control or influence over individual performance measures. The level of influence that the department had over a particular measure affected the target that was eventually set.

Targets are set for six years (2009) to correspond to three state budget cycles, 10 year (2013) to correspond to Mn/DOT's ten year work plan and 20 year (2023) corresponding to the State Transportation Plan. For each of ten policy areas there are sections on outcomes, performance measures and targets, policy directions, policy strategies and coordination and partnerships.

Policy 1: Preserve Essential Elements of Existing Transportation System Outcomes:

- a) Design, construction, maintenance and system management decisions will optimize the years of life and customer utility of existing facilities and minimize life-cycle costs.
- b) The condition of all elements of Mn/DOT-funded infrastructure will be maintained to the appropriate level for the function and use of facilities and to meet customer expectations.

Performance Measures & Targets

• Pavement ride quality is acceptable to customers.

Lane miles of highway pavement that have good & poor ride quality measured by Present Serviceability Rating (PSR)

70% good/2% poor (same all three time periods)

• Airport runway pavement condition maintains safety.

% of airport runways that meet good and poor Pavement Condition Index (PCI) targets

2009 83% good/5% poor

2013 84% good/4% poor

2023 86% good/4% poor

• Pavement maintenance extends service life & reduces long-term costs.

% of roadway miles that have high and low Remaining Service Life (RSL) 50% high /10% low /12-13% average RSL (same all three time periods)

Bridge structural condition meets national and state standards.

% of bridge area on trunk highway bridges 20' or longer that meet structural condition targets for good and poor, based on the National Bridge Inventory (NBI) rating established by Mn/DOT in 1997 and updated in 2001.

2009 60% good/4% poor

2013 61% good/3% poor

2023 65% good/2% poor

• Remaining vehicle life of the transit fleet optimizes investments.

% of transit fleet whose remaining life is within the minimum normal service life Target to be developed

Policy Directions

- 1. Mn/DOT's top priority is to maintain its transportation assets in sound physical condition and to meet system preservation targets.
- 2. Mn/DOT will expand the use of cost-effective preventative maintenance as a strategy to extend service life and reduce life-cycle costs.

Policy Strategies

Coordination & Partnerships

Policy 2: Support Land Use Decisions that Preserve Mobility and Enhance the Safety of Transportation Systems

Outcomes:

- a) State and local planning and development decisions will sustain mobility and safety for travelers and freight. Likewise, transportation system decisions will support land use planning and orderly development.
- b) Right-of-way and land needed to sustain performance in corridors, Regional Trade Centers and major ports and terminals will be protected to minimize life-cycle costs and community conflicts.

Performance Measures & Targets

• Local governments develop plans and ordinances that support mobility on Interregional Corridors (IRCs).

% of local governmental units whose plans and ordinances support Interregional Corridor Management Plans or Partnership Studies by addressing access management. Support will be measured in two categories: substantial and limited.

2009 30% substantial/60% limited

2013 45% substantial

2023 85% substantial

• Airports protect land for long-term development.

% of airports for which airspace or land have been protected to meet safety, noise, and height clearance requirements and expansion plans as identified in airport master plans or airport layout plans.

Target to be developed

• Right-of-way needed for IRC or bottleneck projects is protected.

% of Interregional Corridor and bottleneck removal projects that have been identified in the 10-Year Work Plan for which rights-of-way have been protected, either through purchase, official mapping or zoning.

New – performance measure to be developed

• Right-of-way needed for transit projects is protected.

% of Transit Advantages projects that have been identified in the 10-year construction program for which rights-of-way have been protected, either through purchase, official mapping or zoning.

Target to be developed

Policy Direction Policy Strategies

Policy 3: Effectively Manage the Operation of Existing Transportation Systems to Provide Maximum Service to Customers

Outcomes

- a) The number of hours and days that the service levels of facilities fall below performance targets due to maintenance, construction or regularly procedures will be reduced.
- b) The number of hours and days that facilities do not carry their full capacity or achieve their target speeds due to weather, incidents or other obstructions will be reduced.

Performance Measures & Targets

• Roadways are cleared quickly to restore mobility following incidents, crashes or hazardous material spills.

Average clearance time, from detection to total clearance, for incidents on the instrumented portion of the Twin Cities metropolitan are urban freeway system that occur between 6:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays.

35 minutes (same for all three periods)

Roadways are cleared of snow and ice quickly to restore mobility.

of hours it takes to achieve bare lanes after a weather event ends (hours)

Super Commuter 1-3 Urban Commuter 2-5 Rural Commuter 4-9 Overall System 10

Same for all three time periods

Roads are managed to maintain or increase the traffic they carry.

% of Principal Arterial corridor-miles in Regional Trade Centers 0 and 1 that are highly, moderately or minimally managed.

Target to be developed

Policy Direction Policy Strategies

Coordination and Partnerships

Policy 4: Provide Cost-Effective Transportation Options for People and Freight Outcomes

- a) Competitive transit options will be available to transit-dependent and transit-choice customers where they are efficient, cost-effective and have local support.
- b) Transit advantages on trunk highways will be provided in at-risk and congested corridors during peak periods.
- c) Competitive and integrated options for shipping freight will be available.
- d) Travelers and freight will have access to important national and international destinations at competitive costs and predictable travel times.

Performance Measures & Targets

• Bus service is provided to meet customer needs.

% of bus service hours required to meet transit needs targets identified in the Transit Plan for Greater Minnesota

2009 80%/1.35 million bus service hours

2013 85%/1.55 million bus service hours

2023 90%/2.05 million bus service hours

• Shoulders are constructed along congested corridors to allow bus travel.

Miles of bus-only shoulders along trunk highways in the Twin Cities area.

Target to be developed

• Travel options other than by auto are used in regional trade centers during rush hours.

of commuter person trips in Regional Trade Centers 0 and 1 that use modes other than auto

2009 244,000

2013 259,000

2020 288,000

2023 300,000

• More people travel together during rush hours.

Average auto occupancy in Regional Trade Centers 0 and 1 during peak periods.

1.07 same for all periods

• The cost-effectiveness of passenger rail service is studied to evaluate how efficiently is could meet customer demands.

Completion of evaluations of cost-effectiveness for designated potential local passenger service corridors.

2004 Northstar Corridor

2006 Central Corridor

2010 Red Rock Corridor

• Crossings of Interregional Corridors (IRCs) in regional trade centers have bicycle and pedestrian accommodations to facilitate safe crossing of IRCs.

% of crossings of Interregional Corridors with appropriate bicycle and pedestrian accommodations

Target to be developed

• Most people in Minnesota are within 1 hours of airports with scheduled service.

% of population within one hour's driving time of airports with scheduled service 90% (same for all three time periods)

Airports have good connections to IRCs to better move people and freight.

% of airports with scheduled service that have appropriately designed access to Interregional Corridors

Targets to be developed

• Large traffic generators have adequate connections to IRCs or water or rail corridors to facilitate freight movements.

% of major freight generators with appropriately designed roadway connections to Interregional Corridors and other major rail and water corridors. Major freight generators include commercial water ports and terminals, rail terminals, truck terminals, intermodal facilities and other major freight generating facilities and transfer points.

Targets to be developed

Policy Directions
Policy Strategies
Coordination and Partnerships

Policy 5: Enhance Mobility

Outcomes

a) Travel times for people and freight between Regional Trade Centers will be reasonable and reliable, based on customer expectations.

Performance Measures & Targets

• IRCs meet speed targets to preserve the mobility of people and freight

% of Interregional Corridors miles that meet minimum target speeds.

2009 87%

2013 88%

2023 90%

• Travel time reliability during rush hours meets customer expectations

% of peak period travel that takes no longer than an acceptable travel time. That is, no longer than "expected" travel time plus some additional buffer.

Target to be developed

Policy Direction

Policy Strategies

Coordination & Partnership

Policy 6: Enhance Mobility within Major Regional Trade Centers

Outcomes

a) Travel time for people and freight within Major Regional Trade Centers (levels 0 and 1) will be reasonable and reliable, based on customer expectations.

Performance Measures & Targets

• Twin Cities' rush hour congestion levels compare favorably with similar metropolitan areas.

Twin Cities ranking among metropolitan areas for peak to off-peak travel times as reported by the Texas Travel Institute Travel Rate Index. This measure applies only to the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

Target to be developed

• Travel time reliability during rush hours meets customer expectations.

% of peak weekday travel that takes no longer than an acceptable travel time.

That is no longer than an "expected" travel time plus some additional buffer time.

Target to be developed

The duration and extent of congestion on urban freeways does not worsen.

% of directional urban freeway miles in Regional Trade Centers 0 and 1 that are congested or severely congested.

2009 9-10% severely congested/21-24% congested

2013 9-11% severely congested/21-26% congested

2023 9-12% severely congested/21-31% congested

Policy Direction

Policy Strategies

Coordination and Partnerships

Policy 7: Increase the Safety & Security of Transportation Systems and Their Users Outcomes

- a) Crash rates, fatalities and personal injuries will be continually reduced for all modes of transportation
- b) The security of travelers, freight and transportation systems will be maintained.

Performance Measures & Targets

• Reducing the # of crashes per VMT.

Annual crash rate on state trunk highways using three-year averages.

2009 .96 crashes per MVM

2013 .88 crashes per MVM

2023 .73 crashes per MVM

• Reducing the # of general aviation crashes.

Average yearly total general aviation crashes as reported to and defined by the

FAA

2009 35

2013 32

2023 30

• Reducing the # of crashes between cars and trains at railroad crossings.

Average total crashes occurring at at-grade railroad crossings as reported by the

Department of Public Safety (three-year average)

2009 46

2013 34

2023 15

• Reducing the total # of roadway fatalities.

Annual roadway-related fatalities using three-year averages

2009 590-606

2013 580-604

2023 550-600

Reducing the total # of general aviation fatalities.

Annual average general aviation fatalities, as reported by the FAA for MN

2009 7

2013 7

2023 6

Policy Direction

Policy Strategies

Coordination & Partnerships

Policy 8: Continually Improve Mn/DOT's Internal Management and Program Delivery Outcomes:

- a) The delivery of transportation projects and services will be streamlined, resulting in reduced project development time, while improving cost effectiveness and maintaining quality.
- b) Transportation projects will be completed on the scheduled promised to the public, contractors, and affected communities.
- c) Mn/DOT will achieve the best value from tax dollars by optimizing the cost effectiveness of administrative and program delivery expenditures throughout the department.

Performance Measures & Targets

• The delivery of projects and services is streamlined.

% of Mn/DOT projects in the first year of the State Transportation Improvement Program that are left for construction in the same planned year.

90% (same for all three periods)

 Projects are delivered on the schedule promised to the public, contractors and affected communities.

% variation in major projects' costs from estimates when projects first enter the State Transportation Improvement Program to actual cost when let for construction.

Target to be determined

• Funds will be used in ways that provide the best value for Minnesota taxpayers.

General administrative expenditures as a % of total expenditures.

Target to be determined

Policy Direction Policy Strategies

Policy 9: Inform, Involve and Educate All Potentially Affected Stakeholders in Transportation Plans and Investment Decision Processes

Outcomes

- a) Mn/DOT will proactively seek early and continuing public input and involvement so as to be responsive and accountable to its stakeholders.
- b) Mn/DOT will listen to its customers and respond with accurate, timely information upon which they can rely. Mn/DOT will be a trusted source of information.
- c) Customers will understand Mn/DOT's roles, processes and priorities, and will have access to information about Mn/DOT's projects and activities.

Performance Measures & Targets

• Customers are satisfied with the reliability of Mn/DOT information.

% of customers satisfied with the reliability of Mn/DOT communications, as measured by annual survey (Omnibus Study)

60% (same for all three periods)

Policy Direction Policy Strategies Coordination and Partnerships

Policy 10: Protect the Environment and Respect Community Values

Outcomes

- a) Minimize impacts to the natural and human environment when building, operating and maintaining Mn/DOT's transportation system. Work with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, the lead agency, to achieve its mission to:
 - Ensure clean and clear air that protects human health and the environment.
 - Maintain, restore or improve the quality of Minnesota's waters.
- b) Enhance the value of transportation projects through aesthetic designs that reflect environmental stewardship and community sensitivity.

Performance Measures & Targets

• Required water quality permits with inspection violations continues to decrease.

Outdoor levels of ozone, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide and particulate matter as of \$ of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Estimated carbon dioxide emissions from motor vehicles in MN

% of Mn/DOT fuel consumption defined as cleaner fuels

% of National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Mn/DOT permits that have violations.

Targets to be determined.

• The ratio of wetland acres replaced to acres of wetlands affected meets federal and state requirements.

Ratio of acres replaced by Mn/DOT to acres of wetlands affected.

2:1 in Western MN and 1:1 in Eastern MN (same for all three periods)

• Wetlands are replaced with planned wetland types.

% of replaced wetland types are as planned

Targets to be determined.

• Mn/DOT manages it land with native plant species in order to reduce the need for mowing and pesticides.

of acres replanted with native species

Targets to be determined.

• Conversion of undeveloped land

of undeveloped acres converted to another land use.

2009 10,146 acres

2013 10,626 acres

2023 8,887 acres

• The environmental review process is streamlined.

Time to complete Environmental Impact Statement, Environmental Assessment, Environmental Assessment Worksheet per project.

Targets to be determined

Policy Direction

Policy Strategies

Coordination and Partnerships

Missouri

| Missouri | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT (MoDOT) | |
| RSMo 226.132 Transportation Planthe department of transportation shall create a multimodal, total transportation plan based solely upon the real needs of the state. The department of transportation shall objectively evaluate the actual multimodal needs, including aviation, highways, bridges, rail, transit and water ports, of the state based upon criteria that will enhance the state's transportation infrastructure and economic development well-being and shall submit its total transportation plan to the joint committee on transportation oversight, the president pro tem of the senate and the speaker of the house of representatives by January 2, 2001. | MoDOT's Long Range Transportation Direction (2001) NOTE: A revision to this plan, called the Missouri Advance Planning Initiative, is currently in progress. Transportation Goals (pp 5-6) • Ensure safety and security in travel; decrease the risk of injury or property damage on, in and around transportation facilities. • Take care of the existing system of roads, bridges, public transportation, aviation, passenger rail and ports. • Relieve congestion to ensure the smooth flow of people and goods throughout the entire system. • Broaden access to opportunity and essential services for those who cannot or choose not to drive. • Facilitate the efficient movement of goods using all modes of transportation. • Ensure Missouri's continued economic competitiveness by providing a safe, reliable and efficient transportation system. • Protect Missouri's environment and natural resources by making investments that are not only sensitive to the environment, but also provide and encourage environmentally beneficial transportation choices. • Enhance the quality of our communities through transportation. | Mission: To provide a world-class transportation experience that delights our customers and promotes a prosperous Missouri. (p 1 The Tracker) Dashboard Jan. 30, 2004 (pg a-b) 1. Take better care of what we have Traffic fatality & injury crash rates compared to national average State system traffic fatality and injury crash trend Mof major highway miles in good or better condition Mof deficient bridges Roadway Congestion Index for Kansas City and St. Louis compared to national average Mowing costs vs. herbicide costs Net assets at year end Finish What We've Started Mof projects delivered as programmed Mof projects delivered on time Mof dollars spend on completed projects delivered within budget Build Public Trust Mof customer satisfaction Mof funding level target utilized by programmed projects by category for the current year of the STIP Distribution of funds Revenue dispersion | |
| | | | |

| Tracker Measures of Departmental |
|--|
| Performance July 2005 |
| NOTE: Each of the tangible results listed |
| below is tracked by from 4 to 17 measures of |
| performance. |
| Tangible Results: (p. iv) |
| 1. Uninterrupted traffic flow |
| 2. Smooth and unrestricted roads and bridges |
| 3. Safe transportation system |
| 4. Roadway visibility |
| 5. Personal, fast, courteous and |
| understandable response to customer |
| requests |
| 6. Partner with others to deliver |
| transportation services |
| 7. Leverage transportation to advance |
| economic development |
| 8. Innovative transportation solutions |
| 9. Fast Projects that are of great value |
| 10. Environmentally responsible |
| 11. Efficient movement of goods |
| 12. Easily accessible modal choices |
| 13. Customer involvement in transportation |
| decision-making |
| 14. Convenient, clean and safe roadside |
| accommodations |
| 15. Best value for every dollar spent |
| 16. Attractive roadsides |
| 17. Advocate for transportation issues |
| 18. Accurate, timely, understandable and |
| proactive transportation information |

Missouri Performance Reporting July 2005 Tracker Report

Mission

Our mission is to provide a world-class transportation experience that delights our customers and promotes a prosperous Missouri.

"MoDOT's Mission and Value Statements provide the basis for the Tracker. The 18 results are outcomes that our customers expect to see as we fulfill our mission. Each performance measure listed on the Tracker is designed to help us focus on successfully achieving these results. The Tracker will be published quarterly to ensure accountability and allow our customers to see the progress we are making toward those results they expect."

Value Statements

MODOT will -

- Support and develop employees because we believe they are the key to our success.
- Be flexible because we believe one size does not fit all.
- Honor our commitments because we believe in integrity.
- Encourage risk and accept failure because we believe in getting better.
- Be responsive and courteous because we believe in delighting our customers.
- Empower employees because we trust them to make timely and innovative decisions.
- Not compromise safety because we believe in the well-being of employees and customers.
- Provide the best value for every dollar spent because we're taxpayers too.
- Value diversity because we believe in the power of our differences.
- Be one team because we all share the same mission.
- Use teamwork because it produces the best results.
- Foster an enjoyable workplace because we care about each other and our mission.
- Be open and honest because we must be trustworthy.
- Listen and seek to understand because we value everyone's opinion.
- Treat everyone with respect because we value their dignity.
- Seek out and welcome any idea that increases our options because we don't have all the answers.
- Always strive to do our job better, faster, and cheaper because we want to meet more of Missouri's needs.

Tangible Results

Note: Many of these measures are in development. For each measure, the desired trend and improvement status is displayed. The states of Virginia and Wisconsin were chosen for purpose of comparison because of their similar size and geography.

1. Uninterrupted Traffic Flow

a. Average travel times on selected roadway sections

Measure: travel times for all critical roadway segments

b. Average time to clear traffic incident

Measure: Time of arrival and time for All Lanes Cleared

c. Average time to clear traffic backup from incident

Measure: "Lanes cleared" times and "clear backup" times

d. Percent of retimed signals

Measure: No. of signals that received timing revisions.

e. Percent of signals observed

Measure: No. of signal observations completed

f. Number of customers assisted by the Motorist Assist program

Measure: No. of motorists assisted in response to incident calls

g. Percent of work zones that meet expectations for traffic flow

Measure: Inspections of flow of traffic in work zones

h. Time to meet winter storm event performance objectives on major and minor highways

Measure: Time to restore highways to wet/dry condition

2. Smooth and Unrestricted Roads and Bridges

a. Percent of major highways (all routes functionally classified as principal arterials) that are in good condition.

Measure: On high speed (>50 miles/hour), International Roughness Index; for lower speed routes, a Present Serviceability Rating.

b. Percent of minor highways that are in good condition.

Measure: Same as 2(a).

c. Percent of deficient bridges on major highways.

Measure: Bridges that are rated Structurally Deficient of Functionally Obsolete.

d. Percent of deficient bridges on minor highways.

Measure: Same as 2(c) above.

e. Number of deficient bridges on the state system (major and minor highways). Measure: Same as 2(c) above.

f. Number of miles completed through the Smooth Roads Initiative.

Measure: Number of miles completed under funding provided for this initiative. Goal is 2200 miles in 3 years.

3. Safe Transportation System

a. Number of fatalities and injuries year to date.

Measure: Trends in Missouri is compared to Virginia and Wisconsin.

b. Number of impaired driver-related fatalities and injuries year to date.

Measure: Trends in fatalities and injuries resulting from motor vehicle crashes. involving drivers who are impaired by alcohol and/or drugs.

c. Rate of annual fatalities and injuries.

Measure: Annual fatality and injury rates per one hundred million miles traveled.

d. Percent of safety belt/passenger vehicle restraint use

Measure: Annual trends in safety belt usage by persons in passenger vehicles determined by annual statewide survey of seat belt usage (formula approved by National Highway Traffic Safety Administration).

e. Number of bicycle and pedestrian fatalities and injuries.

Measure: Annual trends in fatalities and injuries resulting from motor vehicle crashes with bicycles and pedestrians. (Missouri compared with Virginia and Wisconsin.)

f. Number of motorcycle fatalities and injuries.

Measure: Annual trends in fatalities and injuries resulting from motorcycle crashes, compared with Virginia and Wisconsin).

g. Number of commercial motor vehicle crashes resulting in fatalities.

Measure: Number of commercial motor vehicle accidents in which one or more persons dies within 30 days of the crash.

h. Number of commercial motor vehicle crashes resulting in injuries.

Measure: Number of commercial motor vehicle accidents resulting in injuries,

compared to Virginia and Wisconsin.

i. Number of fatalities and injuries in work zones.

Measure: Fatalities and injuries resulting from traffic accidents in work zones.

j. Number of highway-rail crossing fatalities and collisions.

Measure: Trends in fatalities and collisions resulting from train-vehicle crashes, compared to Virginia and Wisconsin.

4. Roadway Visibility

a. Rate of nighttime crashes.

Measure: Nighttime crashes on major and minor roadways expressed as crashes per 100 million vehicle miles (HMVM).

b. Rate of wet weather crashes.

Measure: crashes during wet weather conditions on major and minor roadways expressed as crashes per 100 million vehicle miles (HMVM).

c. Percent of signs that meet customers' expectations.

Measure: Under development.

d. Percent of stripes that meet customers' expectations.

Measure: Under development.

e. Percent of work zones that meet expectations for visibility.

Measure: Formal checklist for measuring flow of traffic in work zones.

5. Personal, Fast, Courteous and Understandable Response to Customer Requests (inbound)

a. Percent of overall customer satisfaction.

Measure: Telephone customer surveys.

b. Percent of customers who contacted MoDot that felt they were responded to quickly.

Measure: Under development. Customers who contact a MoDOT customer service center are asked to complete a short telephone survey when their business is complete.

- c. Percent of customers who contacted MoDOT that felt they were responded to in a persona and courteous manner.
 - Measure: Under development. Customers who contact a MoDOT customer service center are asked to complete a short telephone survey when their business is complete.
- d. Percent of customers who contacted MoDOT that understand the response given. Measure: Under development. Customers who contact a MoDOT customer service center are asked to complete a short telephone survey when their business is complete.
- e. Percent of Motorist Assist customers who are satisfied with the service.

 Measure: responses to pre-printed survey forms that were returned to MoDOT by motorists who used the Motorist Assist service.
- f. Number of customer contacts.
 - Measure: Number of contacts via email, telephone or letter through the customer service centers, highway safety, human resources, and motor carriers.
- g. Number of customer inquiries answered within 24 hours. Measure: Records kept by the customer service centers.
- h. Average response time to customers requiring follow up.

 Measure: Customer service center records.

6. Partner with Others to Deliver Transportation Services

- Number of dollars of discretionary funds allocated to Missouri.
 Federal government allocations of discretionary funds (i.e. above formula apportionment) for multimodal projects such as waterway, aviation and transit activities.
- b. Percent of earmarked dollars that represent MoDOT's high priority projects. Measure: Earmarked dollars above formula apportionment for specific high priority Missouri projects.
- c. Number of dollars generated through cost-sharing and other partnering agreements.
 - Measure: Under development. Funds invested in highway construction by cities, counties, transportation corporations and transportation development districts as a result of funds being made available for local construction by MoDOT.
- d. Number of transportation related partnering agreements.
 Measure: Under development. Number of partnering agreements per year that leverage funds for transportation improvements.

7. Leverage Transportation to Advance Economic Development

a. Miles of 4-lane corridors completed.
 Measure: Miles of additional divided highways available to the public.

b. Percent utilization of SIB and STAR loan programs (revolving loan funds).¹

¹ The Missouri Transportation Finance Corporation (MTFC) is Missouri's state infrastructure bank (SIB), a program created by federal law in 1995. The SIB's purpose is: (1) to provide a means to encourage additional investment in

Measure: Ratio of how much of the funds available are currently on loan versus the amount available to loan.

c. Number of dollars invested that enhance specific economic development projects.

Measure: Under development.

d. Number of jobs supported through transportation investment.

Measure: Under development.

8. Innovative Transportation Solutions

a. Annual dollar amount saved by implementing innovative engineering methods. Measure: Savings through value engineering and practical design.

b. Number of awards received.

Measure: Awards presented to the Department by external organizations.

9. Fast Projects That Are of Great Value

a. Percent of estimated project cost as compared to final project cost.

Measure: Completed project cost compared to estimated project cost.

b. Number of calendar days it takes to go from the programmed commitment on the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program to construction completion. Measure: Data tracks time from inclusion in the TIP to completion and use by the public, by type of work and distinguishes between design and construction stages.

c. Percent of projects completed within budget.

Measure: Completed costs compared to estimated cost.

d. Percent of projects completed on time.

Measure: Percentage of projects completed by the commitment date established in the contract.

e. Percent of change for finalized contracts.

Measure: Percentage difference of total construction payments to the original contract award amounts.

f. Average construction cost per day by contract type.

Measure: The actual time used for construction (from the summary of working days in MoDOT's SiteManager database) divided by the total costs of the project. Projects are tracked in three categories: working day contracts, calendar day contracts, and innovative contracts that provide incentives/disincentives to the contractor for early completion.

g. Percent of customers that feel completed projects are the right transportation solutions.

Measure: Statewide telephone survey.

h. Percent of project timeliness as compared to other state DOTs.

Measure: Under development.

i. Percent of projects that represent great value.

Measure: Under development.

10. Environmentally Responsible

- a. Percent of projects completed without environmental violation.
 Measure: LOWs and NOVs (written correspondence from regulatory agencies) by project.
- b. Number of projects on which MoDOT protects or restores sensitive species or habitat
 - Measure: Projects in the vicinity of threatened or endangered species or critical habitat involving US Fish and Wildlife Service review.
- c. Percent of air quality days that meet Environmental Protection Agency standards by metropolitan area.
 - Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet EPA's ground level ozone standard.
- d. Percent of alternative fuel consumed.
 Use of E-85 and biodiesel fuels by MoDOT vehicles and equipment as a percent of total fuel usage.
- e. Number of historic resources avoided or protected as compared to those mitigated.
 - Measure: Number of historic resources in the project footprint and the number of times MoDOT successfully consults with the historic district to make changes to plans to avoid or protect those resources vs. the number of resources for which MoDOT has to mitigate.
- f. Ratio of acres of wetlands created compared to the number of acres of wetland impacted.
 - Measure: Acres of impact taken from Clean Water Act permits, listed by project. Acres of wetland construction taken form roadway design maps or mapped wetland areas restored by MoDOT, listed by project.
- g. Number of trees planted compared to number of acres cleared.

 Measure: MoDOT has committed to plant 2 trees for each 6" or larger tree removed by construction operations. Measure will compare trees planted to trees removed.
- Number of tons of recycled/waste materials used in construction projects.
 Measure: Number of tons of recycled/waste material used in construction projects.

11. Efficient Movement of Goods

- a. Freight tonnage by mode.
 - Measure: Annual port, air cargo, truck and rail tonnage.
- Average travel times for trucks on selected roadway sections.
 Measure: Travel times for a limited number of roadway segments are currently available. Expansion of this measure is under way.
- c. Percent of trucks using advanced technology at Missouri weight stations. Measure: Number of trucks using PrePass system at weigh stations. Number of trucks using 2 weigh-in-motion scales.

d. IFTA miles traveled in Missouri

Measure: Total taxable miles traveled in Missouri by Missouri-based carriers and carriers based in IFTA (International Fuel Tax Agreement) member jurisdictions.

e. Percent of satisfied motor carriers.

Measure: Customer satisfaction survey.

f. Average wait time spent by customers obtaining over dimension/over weight permits.

Measure: Under development.

12. Easily Accessible Modal Choices

a. Number of airline passengers.

Measure: Number of passengers boarding airplanes at commercial airports.

b. Number of rail passengers.

Measure: Number of people using Amtrak train service (both those getting on and those getting off at any point in the state).

c. Number of transit passengers.

Measure: Number of total one-way unlinked transit trips taken by passengers on public transit vehicles.

d. Number of passengers and vehicles transported by ferryboat.

Measure: Number of vehicles and passengers transported by ferryboat.

e. Number of days the river is navigable.

Measure: Number of days the Missouri River is navigable.

f. Number of business capable airports.

Measure: Data collected annually.

g. Number of daily scheduled airline flights.

Measure: Number of airline flights.

h. Average days per week rural transit service is available.

Measure: Reviewing published transit service schedules in each rural county and averaging those daily frequencies within a week's schedule for available countywide transit service calculates the statewide average days per week that rural transit service is available.

i. Number of active transit vehicles.

Measure: Number of active transit vehicles in passenger service.

j. Number of inter-city bus stops.

Measure: Number of inter-city bus stops available each year.

k. Percent of customers satisfied with transportation options.

Measure: Statewide telephone survey.

13. Customer Involvement in Transportation Decision-Making

a. Number of customers who attend transportation-related meetings.

Measure: Number of individuals registered on sign-in sheets at public meetings.

b. Percent of customers who are satisfied with feedback they receive from MoDOT after offering comments.

Measure: Comments submitted at the end of MoDOT public meetings.

c. Percent of customers who feel MoDOT includes them in transportation decision-making.

Measure: Statewide telephone survey.

d. Percent of positive feedback responses received from planning partners regarding involvement in transportation decision-making.

Measure: Surveys of planning partners.

14. Convenient, Clean and Safe Roadside Accommodations

a. Percent of rest areas that meet customers' convenience, cleanliness and safety expectations.

Measure: Inspection of roadside accommodations by MoDOT maintenance employees using a rating tool developed with customer input.

b. Percent of commuter lots that meet customers' convenience, cleanliness and safety expectations.

Measure: Under development.

c. Number of users of rest areas.

Measure: Mechanical traffic counters are placed at four random rest areas for seven consecutive days per quarter. Trucks are measured separately from cars. Travel in both directions is measured.

d. Number of users of commuter parking lots.

Measure: Number of commuter parking lot users.

e. Number of truck customers that utilize rest areas

Measure: District maintenance personnel count the number of trucks parked at rest areas and on nearby ramps within 15 miles of the rest areas monthly.

15. Best Value for Every Dollar Spent

a. Number of MoDOT employees (in salaried positions).

Measure: Data collected in first quarter of each fiscal year.

b. Percent of work capacity based on average hours worked.

Measure: Average regular hours and average overtime hours worked by employees (does not include seasonal or wage employees). Annual leave and sick leave are held constant.

c. Rate of employee turnover.

Measure: Percent of employees who leave MoDOT annually compared to similar-sized, like organizations.

d. Percent of satisfied employees.

Measure: Annual employee survey.

e. Number of lost work days per year.

Measure: Number of days lost due to work related injuries.

f. Information System expenditures per salaried position.

Measure: Statewide accounting system provides these figures.

g. Fleet expenditures per salaried position.

Measure: Statewide accounting system provides these figures.

h. Building expenditures per salaried position.

Measure: Cost of operating department buildings and capital improvements.

i. Utility expenditures per square foot of occupied space.

Measure: Statewide accounting system provides these figures.

j. Dollars expended on non-design related consultants.

Measure: Expenditures recorded in statewide financial accounting system.

k. Percent of vendor invoices paid on time.

Measure: Number of days between the date of service or receipt of goods and the check date.

1. Percent of actual state highway user revenue vs. projections.

Measure: Actual motor fuel taxes, license and fee income, and sales and use taxes compared to projections.

- m. MoDOT national ranking in revenue per mile as compared to pavement condition. Measure: Under development. Will compare Missouri's national ranking in the amount of revenue available to spend on roads and bridges compared to the pavement condition of the roadways.
- n. Average salary of outsourced contract design and bridge engineer vs. full-time employee.

Measure: Compares hourly rate of contracted engineers with MoDOT engineers.

o. Distribution of expenditures by appropriation.

Measure: Compares construction and maintenance expenditures to other expenditures in MoDOT appropriations over time.

- p. Number of lane miles per MoDOT employee as compared to neighboring states. Measure: Number of lane miles per employee.
- q. Number of lane miles per MoDOT employee as compared to the ten best states. Measure: Number of lane miles per employee.

16. Attractive Roadsides

a. Number of hours of litter pickup by MoDOT staff and incarceration crews.

Measure: Number of hours of litter pickup.

b. Number of miles in Adopt-A-Highway program.

Measure: Number of miles adopted.

c. Number of acres mowed.

Measure: Number of acres mowed.

d. Percent of roadsides that customers feel are attractive.

Measure: Under development. Quality assessment checklist under development.

17. Advocate for Transportation Issues

a. Percent of minorities and females employed.

Measure: Percent of minorities and females employed by MoDOT compared to their availability in the Missouri workforce.

b. Percent of transportation-related pieces of legislation directly impacted by MoDOT.

Measure: All transportation bills reviewed for Department impact.

c. Percent of federal roadway earmarked projects on the state highway system.

Measure: Percent of earmarked roadway projects that are on the state highway system and the percent that are identified as needs.

d. Percent of customers who view MoDOT as Missouri's transportation expert. Measure: Annual survey.

18. Accurate, Timely, Understandable and Proactive Transportation Information (outbound)

a. Number of public appearances.

Measure: Appearance information for administrators in the Department.

b. Percent of customers who feel MoDOT provides timely information. Measure: Customer survey.

c. Percent of customers who feel MoDOT provides accurate information.

Measure: Customer survey.

d. Percent of customers who feel MoDOT provides understandable information.

Measure: Customer survey.

e. Number of contacts initiated by MoDOT to media.

Measure: News releases, email, phone, correspondence, etc. are included in the measure.

f. Percent of MoDOT information that meets the media's expectations.

Measure: Survey.

g. Percent of positive newspaper editorials.

Measure: Newspaper editorials are evaluated as to whether they are positive or negative toward MoDOT.

h. Number of repeat visitors to MoDOT's web site.

Measure: Number of repeat visitors to the web site.

New Mexico

| TION NAMED | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT | | |
| NMSA 6-3A. Accountability in | 1999 Long Range Plan (pp 9-11) | Vision: The NMDOT is an international | | |
| Government | Goal 1 . Provide as high a level of service | leader. We are inventors and providers of a | | |
| Purpose: To provide for more cost- | and accessibility to the traveling public as | transportation system that serves everyone. | | |
| effective and responsible government | possible given fiscal and other constraints. | (web) | | |
| services by using the state budget process | Goal 2. Provide for appropriate multi- | Good to Great: Strategic Plan | | |
| and defined outputs, outcomes and | modal uses of the road system and promote | Performance Report 2005 | | |
| performance measures to annually evaluate | intermodal connectivity, especially where | Guiding Principles: (pg.6) | | |
| the performance of state government | economic development may be enhanced or | Multimodal Transportation | | |
| programs. | where commercial use may be made more | Partnership with Tribal Governments | | |
| | efficient. | Partnership with Local Governments | | |
| Performance Measures: To be submitted | Goal 3. Provide citizens maximum | Environmental Responsibility | | |
| each year to the legislative finance | meaningful access to the transportation | Safety and Security | | |
| committee and finance division with the | planning process. Goal 4. Plan for and | Efficient Use of Public Resources | | |
| outputs produced by each program, the | provide appropriate facilities as demand and | Economic Vitality | | |
| outcomes resulting from each program and | use patterns change. Goal 5. Plan for a | Strategic Priorities (pg. 7) | | |
| baseline data associated with each agency's | four-lane-or-more, highway system to | Deliver safe and secure multimodal | | |
| performance measure. | connect all developed or developing areas of | programs and transportation | | |
| | the state. | infrastructure. | | |
| Performance Based Budget: Shall contain | Goal 6. Be sensitive to the impacts of | 2. Expand and maintain a safe highway | | |
| a for each approved program a summary | regulations. | and transportation system. | | |
| including the outputs and outcomes; | Goal 7. Provide technological advice and | 3. Provide efficient and effective | | |
| performance measures and performance | appropriate assistance to counties, local, and | management of government | | |
| targets; and an evaluation. | Native American communities to improve | resources. | | |
| | roads not on the state or federal system. | 4. A great place to work. | | |
| | Goal 8. Pursue and consider alternative | | | |
| | and/or creative funding methods to help | | | |
| | reduce projected revenue shortfalls. | | | |
| | Goal 9. Continue to support the | | | |
| | Metropolitan Planning Organizations | | | |
| | (MPOs) and continue to support | | | |
| | mechanisms for eliciting and encouraging | | | |

| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| | input from citizens, and elected and | |
| | appointed officials outside of the | |
| | metropolitan areas. | |
| | Action I. To the greatest extent possible, | |
| | provide a transportation system that is safe | |
| | and efficient for its users. | |
| | Action II. Provide for a wide variety of | |
| | transportation opportunities among | |
| | integrated and connected transportation | |
| | modes in a reasonable and efficient manner | |
| | to the greatest extent possible. | |
| | Action III. Provide appropriate | |
| | transportation opportunities to all areas of | |
| | the state. | |
| | Action IV. Improve all facets of the state's | |
| | transportation system to the extent that | |
| | fiscal and other constraints allow. | |
| | Action V. Provide all interested parties | |
| | access to the transportation planning and | |
| | project initiation processes. | |
| | Action VI. Be sensitive to environmental | |
| | and cultural concerns of New Mexico's | |
| | citizens and the relationship of the | |
| | transportation system to other agency goals | |
| | and service delivery. | |
| | | |

New Mexico Good to Great Strategic Plan And Performance Report

Strategic Priorities

- 1. Deliver safe and secure multimodal programs and transportation infrastructure.
- 2. Expand and maintain a safe highway and transportation system.
- 3. Provide efficient and effective management of government resources.
- 4. A great place to work.

Strategic Priority 1: "Mobility for Everyone" Deliver safe and secure multimodal programs and transportation infrastructure. (programs are listed below with goals and measures)

Public Transportation

Goal One: Access: Public transportation services are available in each county
Goal Two: Effectiveness: Public transportation services are targeted to meet the

greatest need.

Goal Three: Efficiency: Public transportation services will be provided in the most

cost effective manner available.

Measures: Annual public transportation ridership in rural areas

Annual Welfare to Work ridership in rural areas

Disabled and elderly program ridership

Commute Options, Park and Ride

Goal: Increase vehicle occupancy rates during commute times.

Measures: SECA van pool subscribers by employer

Quarterly passenger counts on park & ride Albuquerque and Northern NM

routes

Future measures: Park & Ride, van pool and rideshare passenger trips

Park & Ride, van pool and rideshare passenger trips % of corridor vehicle

trips

Change in ridership by route, boardings and service

Passenger trips/dollar investment Cost per avoided vehicle trip

Capacity of Park & Ride van pooling use by route

Cost per Park & Ride and van pool trip

Traffic Safety

Measures: Fatalities per 100 MVM

Non Motorized Transportation

Goal: 2,000 miles of roadways designated as bicycle routes

Native American Outreach

Goal: Build meaningful relationships with 22 Tribal Nations

Measure: Memorandum of Agreement % complete

Government to Government

Goal: Increase local government participation in transportation planning

Measure: RPO Member Attendance

Environmental Responsibility

Measures: Performance of projects in meeting environmental goals

Evaluation criteria averages Compost use by NMDOT

Compost stocks installed by NMDOT Compost berms installed by NMDOT Discard tires reused by NMDOT Wetland creation projects by NMDOT Protected wildlife crossings created

Aviation

Goal: Improve New Mexico's airports infrastructure

Goal: Increase intrastate, interstate and international air service to all

communities

Measures: # of projects at New Mexico airports

Local, state and federal contribution for airport capital improvement Actual funding compared to planned airport improvement projects

Infrastructure

Measures: Projects properly scoped and budgeted: Engineer's estimates vs. awarded

bids

Engineering resources in project delivery % of projects let to bid within targeted period

State Transportation Improvement Program/GRIP

Measures: Let cost/programmed amount

% of projects let within programmed year

Strategic Priority Two: Expand and Maintain A Safe Transportation System: Build,

maintain and operate New Mexico's transportation and highway infrastructure program. (also provide reports by the six districts)

Preservation maintenance program - Highways

Measure: % in good condition 4-year average

Goal Interstate 97% Goal Non-Interstate 68%

Preservation maintenance program - Bridges

Measure: # State owned bridges structurally deficient

Sq. Ft. State owned bridges structurally deficient

Maintenance of the Highways

Measure: % of interstate surface miles meeting minimum level of performance

% of non-interstate surface miles meeting minimum level of

performance

Maintenance expenditures per centerline mile by roadway type

Improved pavement surface lane miles

Rest area satisfaction (survey)

Construction Program

Measures: Days to final

% over bid price

Litter Control

Measures: Statewide litter pick up tons

Future measures: # of increased clean-ups per year

of tones of litter removed from roads # of volunteers involved in litter control Dollars spent on litter removal annually

Strategic Priority Three: Provide Efficient and Effective Management of Department Resources

Financial Report

Strategic Priority Four: A Great Place to Work, Recruitment and Retention

Human Resources

Goal: Employer of choice in the state.

Measures: # NMDOT Vacancies

NMDOT Separations % NMDOT Vacancies

Employee Climate Survey Results

Workers Compensation Loss Experience

Fleet Motor Vehicle Accidents

IT

Measures IT Help Desk Calls

DOT IT Project Status

Ohio

| | Onio | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| State Law | Transportation Plan | State Plan/Reporting | | |
| ORC 5501.20 Department | ODOT Goals and Measurable Objectives for Ohio's | ODOT Business Plan 2006-7 | | |
| business plan; career | Transportation System in the State Plan based in part | ODOT performance measures are: Organizational | | |
| professional service | on ODOT Business Plan 2004-5 | Performance Indicators (OPIs) that measure the | | |
| | Mission: We will provide a world-class transportation | department's efforts to achieve its goals, objectives, and | | |
| Not later than the first day | system that links Ohio to a global economy while | mission. OPIs are linked to ODOT's five goals. | | |
| of July of each odd- | preserving the state's unique character and enhancing its | | | |
| numbered year, the | quality of life. (pg 3) | | | |
| director of transportation | Values: (pg 3) | | | |
| shall adopt a rule in | Customer Focus – We will understand and meet the | | | |
| accordance with section | needs of our customers in our policy, program | | | |
| 111.15 of the Revised Code | development and decision-making processes. | | | |
| that establishes a business | People – We commit to developing and supporting a | | | |
| plan for the department of | flexible, technically skilled work force, with individuals | | | |
| transportation that states | and teams that work toward our shared mission and goals. | | | |
| the department's mission, | Continuous Improvement – In the pursuit of excellence, | | | |
| business objectives, and | we will continuously improve our core business functions | | | |
| strategies and that | through better products, practices and procedures. | | | |
| establishes a procedure by | Integrity – We will maintain the highest ethical standards | | | |
| which employees in the | in our dealings with each other, our business partners and | | | |
| career professional service | the environment. | | | |
| will be held accountable | Agility - We will have the knowledge and ability to | | | |
| for their performance. The | rapidly adapt to the opportunities and challenges offered | | | |
| director shall adopt a rule | by changing technology and business practices. | | | |
| that establishes a business | Data-Based Decision-Making: Our decisions will be | | | |
| plan for the department | based on objective measurement, analysis of our system | | | |
| only once in each two | conditions, customers needs and organizational | | | |
| years. | performance. We will manage by fact. | | | |
| | Access Ohio – 30 year plan – affirmed the following | | | |
| | goals in the ODOT Business Plan FY 06-07 with 2006- | | | |
| | 15 objectives for each: (pg 3-4) | | | |
| | Goal 1: Transportation Safety: ODOT will continually | | | |
| | reduce the number and severity of crashes. | | | |
| | Goal 2: Economic Development and Quality of Life: | | | |
| | ODOT will support transportation improvement | | | |
| | opportunities which promote Ohio's economy, foster | | | |

| economic development and enhance the quality of life. Goal 3: Efficient, Reliable Traffic Flow: ODOT will reduce congestion and improve travel reliability. Goal 4: System Preservation: ODOT will achieve and sustain a steady state of manageable and predictable deficiencies in transportation system conditions within an \$825 million annual system preservation budget. Goal 5: Resource Management: ODOT will efficiently manage resources to execute core business functions while maintaining the highest-possible levels of quality and productivity. Strategic Initiatives: Initiative 1: Deliver the Jobs and Progress Plan: Last biennium largest 2 year construction program in ODOT history; delivered 98% of the program for that biennium. (pp 12-13) Initiative 2: Refine, re-focus and respond to Ohio's high-crash locations: Last biennium fatality rate fell from 1.31 to 1.16 fatalities per 100 million VMT/ 800 low-cost safety projects delivered. (pp 14-15) Initiative 3: Complete the highway technician comprehensive training program: To ensure trained inspectors to complete the Jobs and Progress Plan. (pp 16-17) Initiative 4: Continuously improve county operations: measure the cost and quality of ODOT's basic maintenance activities (pp 18-19) Initiative 5: Continuously improve the pavement management process: Pavement management process: (pp 20) Organizational Performance Index (pg 21) Expectations for the operation of ODOT's core business areas. |
|--|
| |

Ohio FY6-07 Business Plan

Includes discussions of Ohio transportation policy catalysts through 2015, external strategic catalysts, strategic initiatives and a financial plan and expectations.

Goal 1: Transportation Safety: ODOT will continually reduce the number and severity of crashes.

2006-2015 Objectives:

- a) Reduce the crash fatality rate from the current rate of 1.31 fatalities per 100 million VMT to not to exceed one fatality per 100 million VMT.
- b) Reduce the frequency of crashes by 10% (40,000 per year).
- c) Reduce rear-end crashes by 25% (25,000 per year).
- d) Target and implement low-cost, short term safety solutions, all medium cost improvements and 80% of the high-cost improvements at high-crash safety locations in the annual safety and congestion work plan.
- e) Continuously reduce the delay between problem identification and countermeasure implementation.
- f) Continuously improve safety and design standards.
- g) Sustain the highest standards and improve on snow and ice removal through new and improved technologies, materials and operation strategies.
- h) Sustain the highest safety standards and improve on safety in work zones through new and improved technologies, materials and operational strategies.

Goal 2: Economic Development and Quality of Life: ODOT will support transportation improvement opportunities which promote Ohio's economy, foster economic development and enhance the quality of life.

2006-2015 Objectives:

- a) Complete macro-corridor projects identified in the Governor's Jobs and Progress Plan.
- b) Reconstruct deficient urban freeway and multi-modal facilities while remaining sensitive to social, cultural and economic aspirations of Ohio's communities.
- c) Improve inter-modal connectivity to reduce congestion, improve safety and preserve the environment.
- d) Protect the natural environment, and historic and cultural resources, by avoiding, minimizing or mitigating the environmental impacts of transportation improvements.
- e) Design projects that are compatible with the essence of Ohio's communities.

Goal 3: Efficient, Reliable Traffic Flow: ODOT will reduce congestion and improve travel reliability.

2006-2015 Objectives:

- a) Target and improve traffic flow on congested road segments identified by the department's congestion management system.
- b) Using the congestion management system, quantify the congestion relief of the department's projects to 2015, using per-capita and aggregate measures.
- c) In congested urban corridors, invest in public transportation projects which add alternative modal capacity to relieve road congestion, and provide travel options.
- d) By 2007, implement district-level freeway operations strategy, with attendant training and quality assurance from central office. The strategy will include:
 - Freeway management systems delivered according to the current TRAC schedule, with advanced elements for maintenance of traffic where possible;

- Freeway service patrols as per warrants;
- Incident response procedures; and
- Local incident management committees, including quick clear practices.

Goal 4: System Preservation: ODOT will achieve and sustain a steady state of manageable and predictable deficiencies in transportation system conditions within an \$825 million annual system preservation budget.

2006-2015 Objectives:

- a) Sustain Ohio's pavements so at least 93% of all state-maintained lane miles meet the pavement condition rating standards
- b) Sustain Ohio's bridges so at least 97% of all state-maintained bridges meet the general appraisal standards.
- c) Sustain an overall level of performance on Ohio's roadways to meet or exceed the standard as defined by a county's composite Organizational Performance Index (OPI).
- d) Complete the reconstruction of 60% of interstate lane miles and sustain a preventive pavement maintenance program on 5% of all appropriate lane miles per year.
- e) Continually research and improve maintenance practices and technology, construction techniques and the use of better materials.

Goal 5: Resource Management: ODOT will efficiently manage resources to execute core business functions while maintaining the highest-possible levels of quality and productivity. **2006-2015 Objectives:**

- a) Continually review the results of the cost accounting system to improve the quality and efficiency of the department.
- b) Manage the construction program to get high quality competitive prices and efficient project administration.
- c) Train and equip an increasingly productive work force that does not exceed 6,031 full time employees.
- d) Maintain a financial plan to meet long-term operational and capital goals.
- e) Continuously focus on creating a quality culture as measured by the Baldrige Criteria.

Other Organizational Performance Index Expectations

| Unit | Performance Measure | 06 Goal | 07 Goal |
|--------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| Legal | Injury frequency rate | -10% | -10% |
| | Injury severity rate | -10% | -10% |
| Construction | % projects completed by revised date | <u>≥</u> 80% | ≥80% |
| | CE Rating # | <u>≥</u> 4 | <u>≥</u> 4 |
| | % of projects finalized in less than 6 months | ≥90% | ≥90% |
| | # projects no finalized within 6 months | <u><</u> 20/mo | <u><</u> 20/mo |
| Contracts | C95 Quality | 90% | 90% |
| | C95 Timeliness | 90% | 90% |
| | EE0 Monitoring | 90% | 90% |
| Equipment | Cars, van - cost per mile (\$) | 0.290 | 0.290 |
| | Dumps - cost per mile (\$) | 1.699 | 1.699 |
| | Loaders - cost per mile (\$) | 32.57 | 32.57 |
| | Pickups – cost per mile (\$) | 0.410 | 0.410 |
| | Dumps – cost per mile (\$) | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| | Loaders – downtime (days) | 2.64 | 2.64 |
| | Car, vans – downtime (days) | 1.75 | 1.75 |

| | Distructions (days) | 1.75 | 1.75 |
|---------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| T | Pickups – downtime (days) | 1./3 | 1./3 |
| Facilities | OPI life track score: Building Life | | |
| | Expectancy=Building Age/(1-Building | | |
| | Condition %) | | |
| | County garages | 95% | 95% |
| | Headquarters | 85% | 85% |
| | Outposts | 95% | 95% |
| | Rest Areas | 85% | 85% |
| | Water Treatment | 67% | 67% |
| Finance | Capital budget program goals | 6.0 <u>+</u> 5% | 6.0 <u>+</u> 5% |
| | Inventory | 6.0 ≥3 | 6.0 ≥3 |
| | MBE goods and services purchases | 6.0 ≥15% | 6.0 ≥15% |
| | Operating budget goals | $6.0 \leq 98\%$ | $6.0 \leq 98\%$ |
| Info Tech. | Availability of network to users (%) | 99.9 | 99.9 |
| | Availability of servers to users (%) | 99.9 | 99.9 |
| | Response to IT problem mgmt issues (6pt | 6 | 6 |
| | scale) | | |
| Plan Delivery | Capital program reservoir (overall program | 25% | 25% |
| - | size available for program delivery – means | | |
| | 125% of the overall program size is available | | |
| | for delivery in the year) | | |
| | Plan package delivered on time (local-let) | 80% | 80% |
| | Plan package delivered on time (ODOT-let) | 90% | 90% |
| | Plan quality (composite score) | 43 | 43 |
| Quality & HR | Training scheduled and attended | 90%/6 | 90%/6 |
| | Performance evaluations completed on-time | 95%/6 | 95%/6 |
| | EEO adverse impact area improvement | n/a | n/a |
| RW Safety & | Complete all identifiedsafety studies | 100% | 100% |
| Mobility | Develop countermeasures and action plans | 100% | 100% |
| Traffic Eng. | | | |
| Traine Eng. | Maintenance of traffic | 4 | 4 |

Oregon

| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| ORS 285A.171: Guidelines | 2005 Draft Update 11-17-05 25 year plan. Not related | Mission: To provide a safe, efficient transportation |
| linking performance | to the performance measures. | system that supports economic opportunity and livable |
| measures to benchmarks; | Key Messages | communities for Oregonians. |
| biennial report. In | Transportation as we've know it in Oregon will have to | Values: |
| consultation with the | change. In order to preserve our standard of living and | Safety: We protect the safety of the traveling public, our |
| Oregon Department of | to continue to improve our economy, we must change | employees and the workers who build, operate and |
| Administrative Services, the | the way we make decisions about managing and | maintain our transportation system. |
| Legislative Fiscal Office | funding transportation. | Customer Focus: We learn from and respond to our |
| and the Secretary of State, | Transportation is the engine that drives Oregon's | customers so we can better deliver quality, affordable |
| the Oregon Progress Board | economy - it moves people, goods and services and | services to Oregonians and visitors. Our customers |
| shall establish guidelines, | ensures access to workplaces. | include travelers, freight movers and others who use our |
| based on best practices, for | We have to look at transportation as one unified system | services and facilities. |
| state agencies to link | that connects modes and jurisdictions seamlessly and | Efficiency: We strive to gain maximum value from the |
| performance measures to | supports our communities, economy and environment. | resources entrusted to us for the benefit of our customers. |
| Oregon benchmarks as | Five Underlying Principles (pg I-18) | Accountability: We build the trust of customers, |
| described in ORS 291.110. | Accessibility and mobility | stakeholders and the public by reporting regularly on |
| As resources allow, the | 2. Economic development | what we are doing and how we are using the resources |
| board shall assist agencies | 3. Equity | entrusted to us. |
| in adopting performance | 4. Safety | Problem Solving: We work with the appropriate |
| measurement frameworks | 5. Sustainability | customers, stakeholders and partners to find efficient, |
| based on achieving results | Six Overarching Strategies (page I-19) | effective and innovative solutions to problems. |
| that contribute to the | 1) Maintain the existing transportation system to | Positive Workplace: We recognize innovation and |
| attainment of Oregon | maximize the value of the assets. If funds are | initiative, we show respect for all, and we honor |
| benchmark targets and other | not available to maintain the system, develop a | diversity. |
| high-level outcomes of | triage method for disinvestment, that is, a | Environment: We provide services and facilities in |
| concern to Oregon citizens. | method of prioritizing system preservation. | ways that protect and enhance the environment. |
| At least once per biennium, | 2) Optimize system capacity and safety through | Goals: (Performance Report pg 51) |
| the board shall report to the | information technology and other methods. | Improve safety. |
| Legislative Assembly on | 3) Integrate transportation, land use, economic | Move people and goods efficiently. |
| state government progress | development and the environment | Improve Oregon's livability and economic |
| toward developing a system | 4) Integrate the transportation system across | prosperity. |
| of performance measures as | jurisdictions, ownerships and modes. | Our Strategies: |
| described in ORS 291.110. | 5) Create a sustainable funding plan for Oregon | Provide outstanding customer service. |
| | transportation | Use innovative program design and technologies |
| ORS 291.110 Establishes a | 6) Invest strategically in capacity enhancements. | to solve transportation problems. |

| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT |
|---|--|--|
| Oregon Progress Board and mandates that each State agency: (a) Identify the mission, goals and objectives of the agency and any applicable benchmarks to which the goals are directed. (b) Develop written defined performance measures that quantify desired organization intermediate outcomes, outputs, responsibilities, results, products and services, and, where possible, develop unit cost measures for evaluating the program efficiency. (c) Involve agency managers, supervisors and employees (d) Use performance measures to work toward achievement of identified missions, goals, objectives and any applicable benchmarks. (e) In consultation with the Oregon Progress Board, Review agency performance measures with the appropriate legislative committee. | Seven OTP Goals (pg I 19-20) Goal 1 – Mobility and Accessibility Goal 2 – Management of the System Goal 3 – Economic Vitality Goal 4 – Sustainability: Goal 5 – Safety and Security: Goal 6 – Funding the Transportation System: Goal 7 – Coordination, Communication and Cooperation: | Improve the return on investment of our transportation funds. Attract, retain and develop an outstanding ODOT workforce. Engage the public, other state agencies, local governments, business and community leaders in solving transportation problems and planning for the future. Increase intermodal linkages to improve access for people and goods. Communicate, educate and inform the public about transportation issues. Performance Measures: 22 - relate to the three goals and customer service strategy and to the Oregon State Benchmarks. |

Oregon Performance Reporting 2004-05 Annual Performance Progress Report – Executive Summary

Includes information on how the performance measures relate to the statewide Oregon benchmarks, a summary of performance target achievement, a summary of this year's success and barriers to achieving performance measure targets, a discussion of future challenges and answers to performance measurement process questions asked of each state agency. For each performance measure there is a discussion of: how the measure relates to the Oregon benchmark; what the benchmark data says about Oregon relative to the goals; how the performance measure demonstrates agency progress toward the goal; compares actual performance to target and explain any variance; summarizes how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards; demonstrates an example of how a department activity relates to the measure; and what needs to be done as a result of the analysis. For each measure the actuals performance measure data is shown from 1998 through 2004 and targets are established for 2005, 2006 and 2007.

Goal 1: Improve Traffic Safety in Oregon

Performance Measures

- 1. Traffic fatalities per 100 million VMT 05 target 1.30
- 2. Traffic injuries per 100 million VMT 05 target 76
- 3. Safe drivers % of licensed drivers who drove safely- 05 target 64%
- 4. Impaired driving-related traffic fatalities % of traffic fatalities that involve alcohol 05 goal 35%
- 5. Use of safety belts % of all vehicle occupants using seat belts 05 target 95%
- 6. Large truck accidents # of large truck accidents 05 target 548
- 7. Rail crossing incidents # of highway railroad at-grade incidents 05 target 25
- 8. Derailment incidents # of train derailments caused by human error, track or equipment 05 target 42
- 9. Satisfaction with transportation safety % of public satisfied with transportation safety (survey results)– 05 target 74%

Goal 2: Move People and Good Efficiently

- 10. Transit annual rides by elderly and disabled Oregonians Average # of public transit rides per person annually 05 target 7.0
- 11. Travel delay Hours of travel delay per capital per year in urban areas (from Texas Transportation Institute)/ 05 target 20.4
- 12. Passenger rail ridership # of rail service passengers 05 target 124,955
- 13. Alternatives to one-person commuting % of Oregonians who commute to work during peak hours by means other than SOV 05 target 30%
- 14. Vehicle miles traveled per capita VMT per capita in Oregon metropolitan areas for local, non-commercial trips 05 target 6,900
- 15. Pavement condition % of pavement lane miles rated fair or better on State highway system 05 target 78%
- 16. Bridge condition % of State highway bridges that are not deficient 05 target 66%

Goal 3: Provide a Transportation System that Supports Livability and Economic

Prosperity

- 17. Jobs from construction spending # of jobs as a result of annual construction expenditures 05 target 12,500
- 18. Fish passage at State culverts # of river miles of habitat opened up for fish passage as a result of culvert retrofits and replacements 05 target 38
- 19. Intercity passenger service % of communities of 2,500 or more with intercity bus or rail passenger service 05 target 95%
- 20. Bike lanes and sidewalk % of urban state highway miles with bike lanes and sidewalks 05 target 15%

Goal 4: Provide Excellent Customer Service

- 21. Customer satisfaction % of customers satisfied (monthly survey) 05 target 85%
- 22. DMV customer services -

DMV field office wait time (22a) – Minutes – 05 target 15

DMV phone queue time (22b) – seconds – 05 target 45

DMV title transaction time (22c) - days – 05 target 21

Virginia

| v n gma | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT | |
| 33.1-23.03. Board to develop and update | 2025 Plan | VDOT's Mission: | |
| Statewide Transportation Plan. The | Six Goals | VDOT will plan, develop, deliver and maintain | |
| Commonwealth Transportation Board shall | Goal 1: Safety and Security: Provide a safe, | on time and on budget the best possible | |
| conduct a comprehensive review of statewide | secure, and integrated transportation system | transportation system for the traveling public. | |
| transportation needs in a Statewide | that reflects the diverse needs throughout the | VDOT Values: | |
| Transportation Plan setting forth an inventory | Commonwealth. (p. 84) | • Safety and Security: Safety will never | |
| of all construction needs for all systems, and | Goal 2: Preservation and Management: | be compromised. Security of our people | |
| based upon this inventory, establishing goals, | Preserve and manage the existing | and our assets must never be taken for | |
| objectives, and priorities covering a twenty- | transportation system through technology and | granted. | |
| year planning horizon, in accordance with | more efficient operations. (p. 85) | Truth, Trust and Teamwork: By | |
| federal transportation planning requirements. | Goal 3: Mobility, Accessibility and | always seeking and telling the truth, we | |
| This plan shall embrace all modes of | Connectivity: Facilitate the efficient | create trust. Trust fosters true | |
| transportation and include technological | movement of people and goods, expand travel | teamwork, with all of us pulling our | |
| initiatives. This Statewide Transportation Plan | choices, and improve interconnectivity of all | share and sharing our talents. | |
| shall be updated as needed, but no less than | transportation modes. (p. 85) | Environmental Excellence: We | |
| once every five years. The plan will provide | Goal 4: Economic Vitality: Improve | conduct our business activities in a | |
| consideration of projects and policies affecting | Virginia's economic vitality and facilitate the | manner that respects Virginia's natural | |
| all transportation modes and promote | coordination of transportation, land use and | and historic resources. | |
| economic development, intermodal | economic development planning activities. | Action and Accountability: We know | |
| connectivity, environmental quality, | (p. 86) | what our job is and we do it. If we have | |
| accessibility for people and freight, and | Goal 5: Quality of Life and Environmental | a question, we ask. We are willing to | |
| transportation safety. It is the intent of the | Stewardship: Improve environmental quality | stand up for our actions and to accept | |
| General Assembly that this plan assess | and the quality of life for Virginians. (p. 87) | responsibility for them. | |
| transportation needs and assign priorities to | Goal 6: Fiscal Responsibility: Improve | • Results and Respect: We take action | |
| projects on a statewide basis, avoiding the | program delivery. (p. 87) | to produce results and measure our | |
| production of a plan which is an aggregation of | | progress. By producing results, we | |
| local, district, regional, or modal plans. | | earn, gain, and retain respect of | |
| | | customers and partners. | |
| | | Quarterly Reports/Dashboard | |
| | | "At the very heart of our performance is the | |
| | | sustained drive to bring construction and | |
| | | maintenance projects in on time and within | |
| | | budget." (First Quarter 2005 Report p. 1) | |
| | | ((| |
| | | Measures in Quarterly Reports (vary by | |

| State Law | Transportation Plan | State DOT |
|-----------|---------------------|---|
| | | quarter) |
| | | Construction Quality Compliance |
| | | Construction On-Time Performance |
| | | Maintenance On-Time Performance |
| | | Construction Contracts Completed w/in Budget |
| | | Maintenance Contracts Completed w/in Budget |
| | | Dashboard Reports – report on projects and |
| | | programs-rated red, yellow, green – drop down |
| | | to detail on projects, programs |
| | | Engineering: |
| | | Studies |
| | | Design & Advertisement |
| | | Project Cost Estimate |
| | | Construction |
| | | Active Projects |
| | | On Time |
| | | On Budget |
| | | Completed Projects |
| | | On Time |
| | | On Budget |
| | | Maintenance |
| | | Pavement Resurfacing |
| | | Lane Miles Paved Planned vs. Actual |
| | | Contracts Planned vs. Actual |
| | | Bridge Condition |
| | | Highway Maint. Exp. Planned vs. Actual |
| | | Environment |
| | | # & % of environmental reports that are in |
| | | compliance with federal and state law |
| | | Safety |
| | | # of crashes vs. 5 year average |
| | | # of fatalities vs. 5 year average |
| | | Fatalities per MVT vs. national average |
| | | |
| | | |

Virginia

VTrans 2025 Phase 3 and Final Report Goals/Objectives/Performance Measures

Goal 1: Safety and Security: Provide a safe, secure, and integrated transportation system that reflects the diverse needs throughout the Commonwealth.

- Improve safety for system users and operators within the system and at mode origins/destinations
 - o Reduction in crashes and/or incidents
- Increase the security of the transportation system and its users
 - o Reduction in security breaches or loss due to theft, vandalism or other incidents.
- Provide the infrastructure, facilities and communications to meet strategic emergency transportation needs.
 - o Ability to meet strategic and emergency transportation needs;
 - o Ability to perform in the event of an attack or natural disaster.

Goal 2: Preservation and Management: Preserve and manage the existing transportation system through technology and more efficient operations.

- Preserve transportation infrastructure to achieve the lowest lifecycle costs and prevent failure.
 - o Reduction in long-term capital costs;
 - o Critical need addressed;
 - o Bridge condition (if applicable).
- Encourage access management techniques that preserve the operational integrity of existing infrastructure while ensuring appropriate access to adjacent land uses.
 - Consistency with local comprehensive plans, MPO plans or other regional plans;
 - o #of access breaks
- Maximize system utilization by increasing the efficiency of existing facilities and services through use of technology and demand management technique.
 - o Tons of freight moved;
 - o # of people moved;
 - o Ease of transition to new technology
- Maintain the effective and predictable operation of the transportation system to meet customers' expectations by using technology and demand management techniques.
 - o Reduction time to clear non-recurring events
 - o On-time performance of system and services
 - o Reduction in travel time variability
 - o Reduction in unexpected delay
- Reduce transfer time between modes.
 - Reduction in transfer time

Goal 3: Mobility, Accessibility and Connectivity: Facilitate the efficient movement of people and goods, expand travel choices, and improve interconnectivity of all transportation modes.

- Reduce congestion all for all modes.
 - o Reduction in VMT
 - o Level of service improvements
 - o Reduction in travel delay

- Ensure seamless connections between modes by providing networks of facilities that facilitate the journey from origin to destination and all connections between.
 - o # of barriers removed
 - o # of links added
 - o Increase in the number of modal connections
 - # of bus turnouts, park-and-ride spaces and bicycle/pedestrian accommodations
- Increase capacity for the movement of people and goods.
 - o Increase in system capacity
- Improve access to major activity centers.
 - o # of modes serving activity center
 - o Frequency of service to activity center
- Meet basic transportation needs for special needs populations.
 - o # of mode choices provided
 - o Service to special needs populations
- Expand modal choices.
 - o # of mode choices provided
 - o # of alternatives to highway travel

Goal 4: Economic Vitality: Improve Virginia's economic vitality and facilitate the coordination of transportation, land use and economic development planning activities.

- Improve accessibility of the workforce to employment opportunities.
 - o # of mode choices
 - o Proximity of service or facility to desired destination
 - Unemployment rate
- Improve accessibility of goods to markets.
 - o # of modes serving market
 - o Travel time
 - o Travel cost
- Improve accessibility of people to goods and services.
 - o # of mode choices
 - o Proximity of service or facility to desired destination
- Promote efficient use of current and future transportation facilities and services by coordinating transportation planning and implementation with local land use planning and economic development goals.
 - Consistency with local comprehensive plans, MPO plans or other regional plans
 - o Consistency with local zoning and land uses
 - o Consistency with local economic development goals

Goal 5: Quality of Life and Environmental Stewardship: Improve environmental quality and the qualify of life for Virginians.

- Maintain and improve air quality by meeting applicable air quality standards.
 - o Projects in conformity reduction in pollutants
- Maintain and improve water quality by meeting applicable water quality standards.
 - o Compliance with applicable water quality standards, including the Chesapeake Bay 2000 Agreement
 - o Reduction in pollutants
- Maintain habitat and watershed quality and connectivity.

- o Improvement in habitat or watershed condition
- Preserve Virginia's rich cultural and historic resources.
 - o # of resources protected and/or enhanced
- Ensure that transportation facilities and services are compatible with the communities and destinations they serve.
 - o Consistency with community and/or destination

Goal 6: Fiscal Responsibility: Improve program delivery

- Maximize use of non-state funds.
 - o % of non-state funds
 - o Funding availability
- Maximize the system benefit of investments.
 - o Level of investment risk
 - o # of purposes project serves
 - o Anticipated return on investment
- Minimize long-term maintenance costs.
 - o Anticipated life-cycle costs
- Leverage opportunities between modes.
 - o # of modes supported
 - o Reliance on another mode/project
- Coordinate completion/implementation schedules and funding of interdependent multimodal projects.
 - o Alignment of schedules and funding
 - o Project readiness

Appendix H

Draft Performance Measure Glossary

Adapted from State of Oregon Guidelines and GASB Glossary

Benchmark

In the context of *outcomes** and *performance measures*, the term refers to desired program results. It may include a target or standard for the program to achieve. It is also used to denote best practices.

Comparable

Able to be compared or suitable for comparison.

Comparisons

Various forms of information about reported *performance measures* that provide a basis for assessing the level of or changes in results. This may take various forms—for example, comparisons of reported information with: (a) several earlier fiscal years; (b) *targets* established by the entity including targets established as part of the budgetary process; (c) externally established norms or standards of performance; (d) other parts or subunits of the same entity; or (e) other, comparable entities.

Consistency

Conformity of information or measures over successive periods of reporting.

Cost effectiveness

A comparison of the cost of a service to the benefits derived from that service.

Customer satisfaction

A type of *outcome* measure derived by using a survey or other type of customer feedback tool to query customers, clients and/or stakeholders on the quality and usefulness of services rendered.

Effectiveness

An ends-oriented concept that measures the degree to which predetermined *goals* and *objectives* for a particular activity or program are achieved. May include both intended and unintended results of a program as part of the measurement of effectiveness.

Efficiency

An *output* or *outcome* relative to a unit of time, money or other *input*. The relationship between inputs to outputs or *outcomes*. Measured by indicators of the resources used or cost per unit of output or outcome. A resource-usage concept, also with a least-cost notion, that is concerned with maximizing outputs at minimal cost or using minimum resources.

Government Management Accountability Project (GMAP)

GMAP focuses Washington State agencies on accountability for meeting *POG* goals. GMAP forums support the POG process by continuously evaluating and improving the effectiveness of POG activities.

Goal

Broad statements of desired results. The condition or state that one is striving to achieve. Usually long-term and may be beyond what might reasonably be expected to be achieved. Goals need not be

^{*} Italicized words are defined elsewhere in this Glossary.

stated in quantifiable terms. Progress toward the goals can be measured by lower-level *intermediate outcomes* and related *outputs*.

Input

A measure of financial and non-financial (e.g., time or staff) resources that are applied to producing a product or providing a service (*output*). Inputs are not considered *performance measures* for external reporting purposes.

Immediate outcome

The result of a product or service that occurs immediately or very soon after the product is delivered or the service is provided.

Intermediate outcome

A measure of a desired result that contributes to achieving an *ultimate outcome* target. One key difference between an ultimate outcome and an intermediate outcome is that the latter is more directly the result of agency or program effort.

Internal performance measure

A *performance measure* that is used within an agency for management purposes. Internal measures cascade down from higher, externally reported measures. They are more numerous, more detailed, and possibly more "output" oriented. These measures are most useful for agency managers to improve their operations, and to hold staff accountable.

Key performance measure

A measure of the essential results or *objectives* of an organization, program or service. A performance measure, shared with the legislature and the public, that shows how the agency is achieving its goals and objectives. As a whole, these measures adequately represent the full scope of an agency's roles and responsibilities.

Mission

Over-arching purpose of an agency or organization.

Objective

A statement of the condition or state one expects to achieve. An objective should be realistic, measurable, generally within the control of the organization, and time constrained.

Outcome

The basic unit of measurement of progress toward achieving an *objective*. An outcome may be *immediate*, *intermediate*, or *ultimate*.

Output

A measure of the quantity of a service or product provided (may include a quality component).

Performance measure

A quantifiable indicator of progress, achievement, and efficiency that includes: *outcome*, *output*, *input*, *efficiency*, and explanatory indicators that indicate how an agency or other entity is carrying out its *mission* and achieving its *goals*.

Priorities of Government (POG)

POG looks at all state activities and how these activities contribute to the framework for 10 statewide results that citizens expect. WSDOT contributes to three:

- Improve economic vitality of business and individuals.
- Improve statewide mobility of people, goods, information and energy.
- Improve safety of people and property.

Strategy

Steps designed specifically to address a priority of an organization. How those steps are articulated can vary considerably. Strategies are often thought of in terms of action items and can be organized under strategic *objectives* or particular *targets* associated with an *ultimate* or *intermediate outcome*.

Target

The desired level of an *output* or *outcome* measure at a specific point in time.

Ultimate outcome

An end *objective*. The end result that is desired or anticipated.

Appendix I

Performance Measures – State of Washington and Other States

Contents

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Goal 1: Safety and Security | 111 |
| Goal 2: Movement of People and Goods Predictably | 115 |
| Goal 3: Effective Management of Transportation Assets & Public Resources | 128 |

POG: TO IMPROVE THE SAFETY OF PEOPLE AND PROPERTY

| Goal 1: Safety & Security: Highway Hazard Reduction | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| 2005 Transportation Partnership Program (TPP) | Gray Notebook Sept. 2005 | 2005 TPP (www.wsdot.wa.gov) | Highway Projects |
| (www.wsdot.wa.gov) | Key measures: | Fix problems at 52 specific high | Target & implement all low-cost, |
| Safety project strategies: | Fatality rates (bicyclist, | accident locations and corridors | short-term solutions, all medium- |
| Remove fixed objects on the roadside | pedestrian, vehicle) | Install 73 miles of cable median | cost improvements & 80% of the |
| Install new or upgrade obsolete guardrail | Before & After Collision Analysis | barrier | high-cost improvements at high- |
| Replace at grade intersections with interchanges to prevent | for Safety Projects | 25 new lane miles of roadway | crash location. (OH) |
| broadside collisions | | Reduce the # of injury accidents in | Vehicular Accidents |
| Build passing lanes to reduce risks of head on collisions | Joint Operations Policy | the affected areas by 25%, | # of commercial vehicle |
| Illuminate county road intersections to avoid night time | Statement (JOPS) Jan. 2005 | Gray Notebook | crashes (FL) |
| accidents | WSP and WSDOT to work | Highway Projects | Frequency of crashes (OH) |
| Widen roads to make safer in case of driver error or | together on policy performance | Highway safety projects – before | Rear-end crashes (OH) |
| inattention. | measures (p 21) | & after study collision data | # of crashes v. 5 year average |
| Build sidewalks and pedestrian bridges and install | | comparison (Dec. 03 p 36/Dec 04 | (VA) |
| pedestrian signals to reduce the risks of vehicular death or | | p 46) | # of fatalities vs. 5-year |
| injury to children or adults on foot. | | Severe collision before & after | average (VA) |
| Joint Operations Policy Statement (JOPS) Jan. 2005 | | cable median barrier Installation | # of motorcycle fatalities and |
| WSP and WSDOT agree to develop a plan to enhance | | (Dec. 03 p 37) | injuries (MO) |
| security of the transportation system identifying high | | # of crossover crashes on US 12 | # of commercial motor vehicle |
| cost/high consequence locations on the transportation | | after installation of center line | crashes resulting in fatalities |
| system (p 20) | | rumble strips (June 04, pg 39) | (MO) |

| Goal 1: Sa | fety & Security: Highway | Hazard Reduction | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| Rest areas: WSDOT and WSP work together to ensure the | | Number of collisions & injuries | # of highway-rail crossing |
| operations of the safety rest areas are conducted to | | before & after roundabout (Dec. | fatalities and collisions |
| maximize the public health, safety and enjoyment (p 21) | | 03, p 38) | (MO/MN/OR) |
| Washington State Transportation Plan 2003-2027 (p 165) | | Combined average for 21 safety | Customer Satisfaction |
| Continuously Reduce Injuries, Fatalities & Risks: A safe | | projects collisions per year (Dec | Customer perception of safety |
| transportation system without deaths or disabling injuries and | | 04, p43) | (MD) |
| with continuous reductions in societal costs of accidents. | | Combined average for 5 new | Customer satisfaction survey |
| Objective a) Reduce and prevent deaths, and the frequency | | safety projects collisions per year | (MI) |
| and severity of disabling injuries and societal costs of | | (Dec 94, p 44) | # of commercial vehicle safety |
| accidents. | | Safety improvement program | inspections (FL) |
| State Highway Plan (2003-2022) (p J-6) | | delivery – planned vs. actual # or | Average clearance time urban |
| Reduce & prevent deaths and the frequency & severity of | | projects advertised (Sept. 03. p | freeways 6:00 AM to 7:00 |
| disabling injuries, and reduce the societal costs of accidents. | | 24/June 03 p 39/March 03 p 5/ | weekdays (MN) |
| Focus on the rate of severity and frequency.) | | June 02 p 7/Sept. 02, p 5/Dec | |
| High accident locations: Eliminate through hazard | | 2002, p 9) | |
| mitigation | | Investment in corrections for | |
| 2) Pedestrian accident locations: Eliminate through hazard | | HAL/HAC (Sept. 03 p 42) | |
| mitigation | | # of low cost safety enhancement | |
| High accident corridors: Eliminate through hazard | | projects at HAL (March 02 p 3/ | |
| mitigation | | Sept 01 p 10/Dec. 01 p 3) | |
| 4) Signals & channelization: Construct | | Corridor safety program before & | |
| 5) Interstate safety: Improve geometrics | | after study – average # of | |
| 6) At-grade intersections: eliminate major at-grade | | collisions per year (Sept 05, p 77) | |
| intersections on multi-lane divided highways with speeds | | Vehicular accidents | |
| >45 mph | | Traffic fatality rates compared to | |
| 7) Risk reduction: Improve roadways where indicated | | US (Sept. 03, pg 25/ March 04 p | |
| 8) Pedestrian risk: Proactively address pedestrian safety on | | 30/Sept. 02 p 5/Sept 01 p 10) | |
| state highways with high pedestrian use | | Fatal and disabling crashes & | |
| 9) Safety Initiatives: Address through low-cost, high-benefit | | VMT (Sept. 03 p 25/Dec 04 p 48/ | |
| and short-term projects | | Sept 01 p 10) | |
| Target Zero: A Strategic Plan for Highway Safety 2000 | | WA State highway related deaths | |
| WSDOT areas: (pp 8-19) | | (June 03, p 40) | |
| 1) Bicycle safety – Provide more facilities for people to bike, | | WA motor vehicle fatalities and | |
| including bikeways, trails, shoulders and bike lanes | | fatality rates (June 04, p 53) | |
| 2) Emergency response – Work with highway departments to | | Bicyclist | |
| strategically locate video cameras on state highways to | | Bicyclist fatality rates by state | |
| better identify crash sites/Work with highway departments to | | (March 03, p 7) | |
| educate staff to better identify crash locations | | Federal benchmarking progress | |
| 3) Large trucks- Promote safe on-road interaction between cars | | bicyclist & pedestrian benchmarks | |

| Goal 1: Sa | afety & Security: Highway | Hazard Reduction | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| and large trucks. | | (March 03, p 7) | |
| 4) Pedestrian safety – Provide improvement dollars for | | Pedestrian | |
| pedestrian facilities. | | Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton | |
| 5) Aggressive drivers – Enhance ITS activities, provide real- | | ranking in large national metro | |
| time traffic information to ease congestion & photo radar | | areas highest pedestrian deaths | |
| programs to reduce driver speed. | | (Dec 04 p 47) | |
| 6) Pedestrian safety –Road environment: Identify & maintain | | Pedestrian fatality rates by state | |
| the overall quality & safety standards of the road, especially | | (Dec 2002 p 11) | |
| in high accident locations | | Safety Rest Areas | |
| 7) Road Environment: Expand the state Corridor Safety | | Rest area service level trends for | |
| Program to address traffic safety problems in more local | | interstate rest areas on I-5, I-90 & | |
| communities/Training to identify traffic safety problems, | | I-82 (March 05 p 39) | |
| conduct data analyses, and develop solutions/partner with | | Overall conditions of 43 highway | |
| utilities to develop policies on the location of utility | | safety rest areas (March 04 p | |
| poles/Develop programs & partnerships for safety projects | | 33/March 05 p 40) | |
| on local roadways/Design and construct divided highways to | | 12 states where demand for truck | |
| indicate turnarounds for emergency response vehicles. | | parking exceeds current capacity | |
| 8) Sleepy Drivers: Increase the use of rumble strips/Develop | | (/March 05, 0 43) | |
| long-range plan for improving highway rest areas | | Park & Ride Lots | |
| 9) Work Zones: Ensure roadway construction has effective | | Park & ride lot security incidents | |
| traffic control/Include buffers etc for worker protection in | | (March 02, p 18) | |
| work zones. | | (α. σ σ γ γ γ | |
| | | | |
| Goal 1: S | Safety & Security: Bridge I | Hazard Reduction | |
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| 2005 Transportation Partnership Program TPP) | | Gray Notebook | |
| (www.wsdot.wa.gov) | | # of bridges in seismic retrofit | |
| At Risk Structures: rehabilitate or replace 30 existing bridges | | plan/# of scheduled bridges (Dec | |
| to extend the life-time of the bridges to ensure they can | | 01, p 14/March 2002, p 16) | |
| continue to meet daily needs, withstand stream erosion and | | bridge seismic retrofit program: | |
| stand up to severe earthquakes. Includes: | | planned vs. actual # of projects | |
| Alaska Way Viaduct | | advertised (Dec. 02, p 15/Sept. | |
| • 520 bridge | | 2003, p 32) | |
| Central Puget Sound: 113 bridges in high risk zone/59 | | | |
| moderates | | | |
| 0/ | | 1 | |

| Goal 1: Safety & Security: Washington State Ferries | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals Benchmarks/Key Measures Other Measures States: Other Measures | | | States: Other Measures |

• 26 bridge replacements

| Goal 1: Safety & Security: Washington State Ferries | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| Security Guide for WSF (pp 1-2) | Joint Operations Policy | Gray Notebook Sept 05 | Port compliance with the |
| The goal of the WSF Security Plan is to keep our | Statement (JOPS) Jan. 2005 | Safety Management System internal | Maritime Transportation |
| passengers and crew safe while meeting regulatory | WSP and WSDOT to work together | audit | Security Act of 2002 (MD) |
| requirements, with minimal disruption to our customers. | on policy performance measures (p | | • |
| Joint Operations Policy Statement (JOPS) Jan. 2005 | 21) | | |
| Safety & security of passengers & crew onboard ferries and | | | |
| in terminals (p 19) | | | |
| Washington State Ferries Security Plan approved March 04 | | | |
| Washington State Ferries Progress Report 2003 | | | |
| Security: (pp 25-27) | | | |
| WSF Security Committee to: | | | |
| facilitate implementation of security measures | | | |
| accurate/timely communications | | | |
| reaction to pertinent emerging security issues | | | |
| Conformance with Maritime Transportation Security Act | | | |
| (MTSA) of 2002 & Coast Guard implementing regulations | | | |
| Safety (pg 28-29) | | | |
| Implementation of new federal lifesaving rules | | | |
| Coast Guard approval of Safety Risk Assessment & | | | |
| Alternative Compliance Plan | | | |
| Washington State Transportation Plan 2003-2027 (p 166) | | | |
| Increased Security: Customers are safe and secure while | | | |
| using the transportation system. | | | |
| Objective a) Improve emergency response systems. | | | |
| Objective b) Increase the security of the transportation system | | | |

| Goal 1: Safety & Security: Emergency Management | | | |
|--|-------------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| Joint Operations Policy Statement (JOPS) Jan. 2005 | | | |
| WSP & WSDOT meet annually to improve disaster | | | |
| response | | | |
| Washington State Comprehensive Emergency Management | | | |
| Plan (CEMP) Basic Plan 03 WSDOT Roles (Section 34) | | | |
| ESF Joint Primary Agency | | | |
| 24 responsibilities related to transportation system | | | |
| emergency management | | | |
| Business Plan 2003-2007 | | | |
| Establish Emergency Operations Center (EOC) programs to | | | |
| address emergency situations arising from security and natural | | | |

| Goal 1: Safety & Security: Emergency Management | | | |
|--|-------------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| disasters and complete regular emergency exercises involving | | | |
| appropriate WSDOT divisions. (p 5) | | | |
| Washington Transportation Plan 2003-2022 (p 165) | | | |
| Goal: Customers are safe and secure while using the | | | |
| transportation system. | | | |
| Improve emergency response systems. | | | |

POG: TO IMPROVE STATEWIDE MOBILITY OF PEOPLE, GOODS, INFORMATION & ENERGY

| Goal 2: Movement of People and Goods Predictably: Efficient Use of Highways | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| 2005 Transportation Partnership | Gray Notebook Sept. 05 (p 2) | 2005 Transportation Partnership | System Operations |
| Program TPP) (www.wsdot.wa.gov) | MAP targets: rating for 22 highway | Program TPP (www.wsdot.wa.gov) | Projects with traffic operations |
| Movement strategies: | maintenance activities | Fix problems at 48 high accident | (ITS/Demand management/ access |
| Checkpoints & congestion: improve | Congestion: Peak travel time for key | locations and corridors | management) provided (FL) |
| the flow of traffic by adding lanes, | commute routes: % of change in travel | Add approximately 125 new lane | % of principal arterial corridor miles in |
| improving interchanges and | time performance for 22 Puget Sound | miles of roadway | urban areas that are highly, |
| constructing High Occupancy Vehicle | routes | Reduce the number of injury | moderately or minimally managed |
| (HOV) lanes | Incident response: Average # of | accidents by approximately 2000 per | (MN) |
| Freight mobility: Replace six bridges | minutes to clear incidents that last over | year | Customer Sat. (MI) |
| and make other improvements to assist | 90 minutes | Replace six bridges and make other | Congestion |
| freight transportation on our state | RCW 47.01.012 | improvements to assist freight | Daily person-hours of delay (FL) |
| highways, local roadways and rail | Traffic congestion on urban state | transportation on our state highways, | # of lane miles contracted for |
| systems | highways shall be significantly reduced | local roadways and rail systems. | capacity improvement (FL) |
| Joint Operations Policy Statement | and be no worse than the national | Maintenance Accountability Process | Total budget for intrastate highway & |
| (JOPS) Jan. 2005 | mean | (MAP) (CY 2004 report p 1) | arterial construction/# of lane miles |
| WSDOT, Washington State Patrol | Delay per driver shall be significantly | 34 performance measures in seven | let to contract. (FL) |
| (WSP) and Washington State | reduced and no worse than the | maintenance areas: | % of lane miles with average annual |
| Association of Fire Chiefs) will | national mean | 1. Roadway maintenance & operations | volumes below congested levels |
| collaborate to safely clear highway | Per capita vehicle miles traveled shall | (5 measures) | (MD) |
| incidents within .90 minutes. | be maintained at 2000 levels | Drainage maintenance & slope repair (5, magazines) | Peak-period congestion of freeways The matter area (MD) |
| WSDOT will deploy roving Incident Page 17 (IDT) | The non-auto share of commuter trips | (5 measures) | in the metro area (MD) |
| Response Team (IRT) | shall be increased in urban areas | Roadside & vegetation management F management | Reduction in incident congestion delay (MD) |
| Business Directions 2003-2007 | | 5 measures) | delay (MD) |
| Goal: Maintain and operate the | | 4. Bridge & urban tunnel maintenance & | % of Interregional Corridor miles most minimum target speeds (MN) |
| transportation facilities and systems | | operations (6 measures) | meet minimum target speeds (MN) |

| Goal 2: Movement of People and Goods F | Predictably: Efficient Use of Hi | ghways |
|---|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| placed under the department's responsibility making cost-effective use of the appropriations provided by the legislature from citizens' taxes. • Maintain highways to the level of service designated by the legislature. • Define highway maintenance productivity and costing measurements. Goal: Optimize the operational efficiency and safety of the transportation systems and facilities committed to WSDOT's charge. • Improve travel time reliability by improving incident response and motorist assistance. • Continue improving the overall quality and accessibility of transportation Systems (ITS) plan to incorporate possible ITS elements and related communication infrastructure into the highway construction program. • Improve interrelation of various traveler information tools, including the Web site, HAR, VMS, and 511, and facilitate linkages to private sector traveler assistance such as private wireless in-vehicle systems, radio and TV traffic reporting, etc., to provide better customer information and improve highway clearance strategies. • Implement the SR 167 HOT Lane pilot project to demonstrate benefits of congestion pricing and managing | | |

| Goal 2: | Movement of People and Goods | s Predictably: Efficient Use of Hi | ghways |
|--|------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| System Operations & Maintenance: The | - | Repairs of sign bridges (Dec 02/ | |
| transportation system operates effectively, | | (p 18/June 02 p 15/Dec 01 p 7/Sept | |
| efficiently and predictably.(p 161) | | 01 p 11) | |
| Objective a) Maintain the effective and | | # of incandescent bulbs in traffic | |
| predictable operation of the | | signals converted to LED units (Sept | |
| transportation system to meet | | 01 p 11) | |
| customer's expectations. | | Annual energy costs for the operation | |
| Objective b) Increase the efficiency of | | of WSDOT traffic signals (Sept 01 p | |
| operating the existing systems | | 11) | |
| and facilities | | Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled | |
| Special Needs Transportation: | | (Benchmark) | |
| Transportation system provides all citizens | | Annual vehicle miles traveled per | |
| access to basic services. (p 162) | | capita (June 04, p 54) | |
| Objective a) Meet all basic transportation | | Delay per drive (Benchmark) | |
| needs for special needs | | Washington State travel growth | |
| populations | | (March 03 p 36) | |
| Congestion Relief: WTP corridors operate | | VMT per capita by state (March 03 p | |
| with minimal delay and continual reduction | | 36) | |
| in the societal, environmental, and | | Avalanche Control | |
| economic costs of congestion for people | | Closure times: I:90, Snoqualmie pass | |
| and freight. (p 164) | | (Sept 04 p 62/March 03 p 9/Sept 02 | |
| Objective a) Reduce person and freight | | p 11) | |
| delay on WTP corridors. | | Snow & Ice Removal | |
| Objective b) "Travel Time" objective to be | | Winter severity and snow and ice | |
| developed in future updates. | | expenditures (March 04 p 36/March | |
| Objective c) "Reliability" objective to be | | 03 p 9/Dec 01 p 7/Dec 04 p 44) | |
| developed in future updates. | | Statewide anti-icer use and winter | |
| Increased Travel Options: Throughout the | | road level of service (March 04 p | |
| state, travelers have viable alternatives to | | 36/March 03 p 9/Dec 04 p 45) | |
| the privately owned automobile for their | | Mountain pass closure hours/year, | |
| trips. (p 164) | | and inches of snowfall (Dec 05, p. | |
| Objective a) Improve existing travel | | 44) | |
| options. "Travel options" is | | Delay and Congestion | |
| defined as new options and | | WSDOT's congestion measurement | |
| better quality of existing options | | principles (Sept. 05 p 58/Sept 04 p | |
| based on market demand. | | 46) | |
| Seamless Connections: The | | Use real-time measurement | |
| transportation system offers easy | | 2. Measure incident congestion | |
| connections between different services | | separate from inadequate | |

| Goal 2: | Movement of People and Goods | s Predictably: Efficient Use of Hi | ghways |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| throughout the state. (pp 164-165) | - | capacity | |
| Objective a) Create links and remove | | Show whether reducing | |
| barriers between transportation | | congestion from incidents will | |
| facilities and services. | | improve travel time reliability. | |
| Competitive Freight Movement: Freight | | 4. Use plain English | |
| movement is reliable and transportation | | Demonstrate long-term & short- | |
| investments support Washington's | | to-intermediate results | |
| strategic advantage. (p 167) | | 6. Use apples to apples | |
| Objective a) Reduce barriers that delay | | comparison | |
| the effective and reliable | | Peak travel times: Key commute | |
| movement of freight. | | routes changes in travel time | |
| Objective b) Maintain the ability to move | | performance (Sept 05 p 59/Sept 04 p | |
| freight and goods in the events | | 45/March 03 p 13/ March 02 p 7- | |
| of alterations to the | | 8/June 01, p 9) | |
| Columbia/Snake River system | | % of days when speeds were less | |
| as a transportation right-of-way. | | than 35 mph – 20 Puget Sound | |
| Support for tourism: Recreational travelers | | commutes (Sept 05 pp 61-62/Sept 04 | |
| have convenient and inviting access to | | pp 47-48) | |
| tourist destinations. (pp 167) | | Average weekday throughput loss | |
| Objective a) Increase traveler information | | during heaviest congestion (Sept 05 | |
| to tourist destinations. | | pp 63-64) | |
| Objective b) Improve the quality of | | Case studies before & after results | |
| tourists' travel-related | | (Sept 05 pp 65-66/Sept 04 pp 51- | |
| experiences in Washington. | | 52/March 03 p12) | |
| State Highway Plan (2003-2022) | | HOV lane and general purpose lane | |
| Maintain the effective & predictable | | person throughout comparison (Sept | |
| operations of the transportation system to | | 05 p 67) | |
| meet customer's expectations. Average | | Change in person throughput per | |
| service level of C+ (p J-1) | | lane during peak periods (Sept 05 p | |
| 1. Bridge & urban tunnels | | 68) | |
| 2. Drainage | | Puget Sound freeway delay and VMT | |
| 3. Repair & disaster – repair damage | | (Sept 04 p 49) | |
| 4. Roadside & landscape maintenance | | % of productivity lost due to delay | |
| 5. Roadway maintenance & operations | | (Sept 04 p 50) | |
| 6. Safety rest areas | | Traffic & Employment: Total | |
| 7. Snow & ice control | | employment Puget Sound/ March | |
| 8. Traffic services | | average weekday traffic volumes | |
| Increase the efficiency of operating the | | (March 03 p 10) | |
| existing systems & facilities (p J-2) | | Average travel time to work: state | |

| Goal 2: Movement of People and Goods Predictably: Efficient Use of Highways | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| 1. Dispatch & traffic control – 24 hr day | | ranking (March 03, p 6) | |
| 2. Low cost enhancements – implement | | Travel rate index (June 01, p 8) | |
| Low cost traveler info – basic level | | Daily vehicle hours of delay per mile | |
| 4. Traffic flow & safety investigations – | | (June 01, p 8) | |
| 5. Traffic flow control – management | | Lane miles added to SHS (June 01, p | |
| techniques | | 16) | |
| 6. Traveler information systems | | Commuter Options | |
| Increase traveler info to tourist | | Public vanpools operating in WA | |
| destinations (p J-2) | | (Sept 04 p 67/Dec 02 p 23/Sept 02 p | |
| Local partnerships | | 14/June 02 p 19/Sept 01 p 6/June 01 | |
| Tourist attraction signing | | p 7) | |
| Reduce the barriers that delay the | | Statewide VanShare & vanpool | |
| effective & reliable movement of freight (p | | trends (June 04 p 44/March 04 p | |
| J-5) | | 45/Dec 03 p 53/Sept 03 p 37/June 03 | |
| Advanced technology for commercial | | p 51/March 03 p 25) | |
| vehicles | | VanShare trends: # of VanShare | |
| Expand CVISN statewide | | groups (March 03, p 25/Dec 02 p 23) | |
| Mobility: reduce person & freight delay on | | Puget Sound region park & ride lots | |
| WTP corridors (p J-5) | | % of capacity used (June 04 p | |
| Puget Sound core HOV lanes | | 44/March 04 p 45/Dec 03 p 53/Sept | |
| Access management developed | | 03 p 37/June 03 p 51/March 03 p | |
| corridors | | 26/Dec 02 p 4/Sept 02 p 15/June 02 | |
| Access management for new | | p 19/March 02 p 17/Sept 01 p 7) | |
| developed corridors | | Comparing drive-along rates: CTR | |
| 4. "Congested" non-HHS | | sites, Washington & US (March 04 p | |
| 5. "Congested" HSS | | 46) | |
| Mobility: Improve existing travel options (p | | WA State commuting patterns (Sept | |
| J-5) | | 30 p 15) | |
| Bicycle/pedestrian corridors | | Drive alone comparative data from | |
| Mobility: Create links & remove barriers | | the 2000 census (June 02 p 20) | |
| between facilities and services (p J-5) | | All employees in Seattle/employees | |
| Multi-modal facilities – improve | | at CTR sites & changes in CTR | |
| connections | | employee commuting Seattle CBD | |
| 2. Urban bicycle – increase networks | | (Dec 01 p 17) | |
| Reduce barriers that delay the effective & | | Participating employer sites (June 01) | |
| reliable movement of freight (p J-7) | | p 6) | |
| All weather roadways - freeze/thaw | | Private investment in commute | |
| 2. Avalanche & flood closures -reduce | | choices (June 01 p 6) | |
| closures | | Vanpooling share of daily Puget | |

| Goal 2: Movement of People and Go | ods Predictably: Efficient Use of Hig | ghways |
|---|--|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| Plans/Goals 3. Freight trunk system 4. Height restricted bridges – replace or reconstruct 5. Bridge overloads – rebuild 6. Border crossings – reduce delay 7. International trade/port access – improve Benchmarks/Key Measures Benchmarks/Key Measures Benchmarks/Key Measures Benchmarks/Key Measures Benchmarks/Key Measures Benchmarks/Key Measures | Sound area VMT (June 01 p 7) Travel Information Daily call volume (Sept 05 p 73) Total calls (June 04 p 43/March 04 p 44/Dec 03 p 52/Sept 03 p 36/June 03 p 50/Dec 02 p 22/Sept 02 p 9) Website usage-average daily page views (Sept 05 p 73/June 04 p 43/March 04 p 44/Dec 03 p 52/Sept 03 p 36/June 03 p 50/March 03 p 24/Dec 02 p 22) Daily average page views per month (Dec 02 p 52/Sept 02 p 10) Highest one day total (Dec 03 p 52) Attitudes towards the driving experience & the personal value of online traffic info LA vs. Seattle (June 03 p 50) Trucks, Goods and Freight Revenue prorated to Washington State for trucks in interstate use (Dec 04 p 54/June 03 p 46/June 02 p 12) Daily truck trips in WA (Dec 04 p 54) Average monthly cross-border truck volumes (Dec 04 p 54/June 03 p 47) Cross border truck volume (June 02 p 13) Mainline rail capacity current & projected operations (Dec 04 p 55) # of days at Snoqualmie Pass impacted by closures (Dec 04 p 56) Transponder usage CVISN weigh stations (Sept 04 p 66) Trucks that bypassed weigh stations using CVISN or weigh in motion (June 02 p 12) Benefits of CVISN and WIM (June 02 p 49) # of trucks with transponders (June 02 p 49) | States: Other Measures |

| Plans/Goals Benchmarks/Key Measures Other Measures States: Other Measures | Goal 2: Mo | Goal 2: Movement of P | eople and Goods Predictably: Efficient Use of | Highways |
|--|------------|-------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | als | Plans/Goals Benchmarks/ | , | States: Other Measures |
| 03) Frieight shipments to, from and within WA Quine 03 p 45) Heavy trucks as share of total daily vehicle volumes (June 02 p 11) # of or egistrations for trucks in WA not registered for interstate use (June 02 p 11) # of overdimensional trucking permits (June 02 p 14) Non-electronic overweight/oversize permit turn around times (Dec 04 p 80) Overweight/oversize motor vehicle permit revenues (Dec 04 p 80) Overweight/oversize motor vehicle permit revenues (Dec 04 p 80) Leading bridges in WA with posted weight restrictions below legal load limitations (June 02 p 14) Signal Re-Timing Cumulative performance in signal retining (March 05 p 63) Time savings for motorists resulting from traffic signal resynchronization (March 05 p 63) Incident Response # of responses & overall average clearance time (Sept 05 p 74March 05 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 04 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 104 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 104 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 104 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 104 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 104 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 104 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 104 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 104 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 104 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 104 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 104 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 104 p 60/Dec 03 p 50/Sept 04 p 68/Sept 04/Sept 04/Sept 04/Sept 04/Sept 04/Sept 04/Sept 04/Sept 04/Sep | | Pidns/Godis Benchmarks/ | Freight shipments to, from and within WA (June 03 p 45) Heavy trucks as share of total daily vehicle volumes (June 02 p 11) # of registrations for trucks in WA not registered for interstate use (June 02 p 11) # of overdimensional trucking permit (June 02 p 14) Non-electronic overweight/oversize permit turn around times (Dec 04 p 80) Overweight/oversize motor vehicle permit revenues (Dec 04 p 80) Leading bridges in WA with posted weight restrictions below legal load limitations (June 02 p 14) Signal Re-Timing Cumulative performance in signal retiming (March 05 p 63) Time-savings for motorists resulting from traffic signal resynchronization (March 05 p 63) Incident Response # of responses & overall average clearance time (Sept 05 p 74/March 0 p 50/Sept 04 p 58/Sept 04 p 60/Dec 0 p 50/Sept 04 p 58/Sept 04 p 60/Dec 0 p 50/Sept 03 p 34/June 03 p 42/ March 03 p 14/Dec 02 p 12/Dec 01 p 9/June 01 p 10) Incidents lasting less than 15 minutes (Sept. 05 p 74/March 05 p 50/Sept 04 57/ Dec 03 p 50/ Average clearance time for incidents lasting 15 to 90 minutes (Sept 03 p 34/March 04 p 41) Incidents lasting 15 to 90 minutes (| |

| Goal 2: | Movement of People and Goods | s Predictably: Efficient Use of Hi | ghways |
|-------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| | | Other Measures 57/June 03 p 42/March 03 p 14 Average clearance time for incidents lasting over 90 minutes (Sept 03 p 34/Dec 03 p 50/March 04 p 41/June 03 p 42/Dec 02 p 13/) Incidents lasting 90 minutes and longer (Sept. p 74/March 05 p 50/ Sept 04 p 57/March 04 p 42 Dec 03 p 50/ Sept 03 p 34/Sept 02 p 8) # of responses & average clearance times for fatality collisions (Sept. p 74/June 03 p 42 Incident response types (Sept. p 74/June 03 p 42 Incident response types (Sept. p 74/March 05 p 50/June 04 p 41/March 04 p 42/Dec 03 p 51/Sept 03 p 35/June 03 p 43 Service actions taken for non-collision (Sept. p 74/March 05 p 50/June 04 p 41/Dec 03 p 51/Sept 03 p 35/June 03 p 43/March 03 p 15/Dec 02 p 12/Sept 02 p 8) Total # of responses by month (Dec 04 p 69/ Sept 04 p 57/March 04 p 41/Dec 03 p 50/Dec 04 p 50/ Dec 02 p 12/Sept 02 p 7 # of responses to all incidents (Dec 04 p 69/Sept 03 p 34/Sept 02 p 9 Clearance time by response mode (Dec 04 p 69 Debris blocking traffic (Sept 04 p 58) Blocking disabled vehicles (Sept 04 p 58) Blocking disabled vehicles (Sept 04 p 58) WSDOT incident response teams response time and clearance time | |
| | | (Sept. 01 p 17) • By incident duration: response by | |
| | | roving units as compared to response | |

| Goal 2: | Movement of People and Goods | s Predictably: Efficient Use of Hi | ghways |
|---|------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures by called out notified units (June 04 p | States: Other Measures |
| | | 41/ March 04 p 42) | |
| | | Distribution of incident clearance times | |
| | | (Sept 03 p 34) | |
| | | Response time for the WSDOT incident response teams statewide March 02, p | |
| | | 9 | |
| | | Service patrol contacts (Dec 01 p9) | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Goal | 2: Moving People and Goods P | redictably: Washington State Fe | erries |
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| Ten Year Passenger Strategy for WA's | Gray Notebook Sept. 05 (p 2) | Washington State Ferries Progress | |
| Multimodal Ferry Transportation | On-time performance | Report 2003 | |
| System Jan. 2005 (p. 51-52) | | • System-wide ridership trends (p 17) | |
| Four guiding principles 1. Cost-effectively utilize existing assets & | | Ridership statistics by route (p 18)Trip completion/most common trip | |
| passenger carrying capacity | | cancellation causes/vessel-related | |
| 2. Leverage the region's multi-modal | | missed trips (p 19) | |
| transportation infrastructure & | | Gray Notebooks | |
| investments. | | Customer Service | |
| 3. Mitigate bottlenecks & chokepoints in | | Total # of complaints per 100,000 | |
| WSF's system to increase overall | | customers (Sept 05 p 79/March 05 p | |
| network efficiency. | | 55/Dec 04 p 72/Sept 04 p 69/June 04 p | |
| 4. Be operationally & financially | | 46/March 04 p 49/Dec 03 p 54/Sept 03 | |
| sustainable Update of Ferry Strategic Plan 2005 | | p 38/June 03 p 52/March 03 p 27/Dec 02 p 25/Sept 02 p 16/June 02 p | |
| (www.wsdot.wa.gov) | | 22/March 02 p 19/Dec 01 p 22/Sept 01 | |
| 4 Principles | | p 13) | |
| The Plan must be realistic and cost- | | Common complaints per 100,000 | |
| constrained. | | customers (Sept 05 p 79/March 05 p | |
| 2. Financial constraints will place a firm | | 55/Dec 04 p 72/Sept 04 p 69/June 04 p | |
| boundary on the service scenarios that | | 46/March 04 p 49/Dec 03 p 54/Sept 03 | |
| will be considered and limit exploration | | p 38/June 03 p 52/March 03 p 27/Dec | |
| of options to those that may realistically | | 02 p 25/June 02 p 22/March 02 p | |
| be implemented. | | 19/Dec 01 p 22/Sept 01 p 13) | |

| Goal 2: Moving People and Goods Predictably: Washington State Ferries | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| 3. The Plan must address system-wide | | # of visitors and itineraries (March 05 p | |
| implications. | | 60) | |
| 4. Service alternatives for individual | | Trip Reliability | |
| routes or service corridors will be | | Average missed trip per commuter | |
| evaluated based on their impact to the | | (Sept 05 p 80/March 05 p 55/) | |
| entire ferry system. | | Trip reliability index missed trips per | |
| Business Directions 2003-2007 | | 400 sailings (Dec 04 p 73/Sept 04 p | |
| Goal: Maintain and operate the | | 70/June 04 p 47/March 04 p 50/Dec 03 | |
| transportation facilities and systems | | p 55/Sept 03 p 39/June 03 p 53 March | |
| placed under the department's | | 03 p 28/Dec 02 p 26/Sept 02 p 17/June | |
| responsibility making cost-effective use of | | 02 p 23 March 02 p 20/Dec 01 p 23/ | |
| the appropriations provided by the | | Sept 01 p 14) | |
| legislature from citizens' taxes. | | Most common trip cancellations (March | |
| Maintain ferry boats and terminals to | | 05 p 56/Dec 04 p 73/Sept 04 p 7June | |
| ensure reliability of service. | | 04 p 47/March 04 p 50/Dec 03 p 55/ | |
| Operate the ferries to ensure on-time | | Sept 03 p 39/June 03 p 53 March 03 p | |
| performance | | 28/Dec 02 p 26/Sept 02 p 17/June 02 p | |
| New Vessel Program (www.wsdot.wa.gov) | | 23 March 02 p 20/Dec 01 p 23/Sept 01 | |
| 4 new ferries to replace older | | p 14) | |
| ferries/restore capacity in system | | On-Time Performance | |
| Washington State Ferries Progress | | On-time performance(Sept 05 p | |
| Report 2003 | | 79/March 05 p 56/Dec 04 p 73/Sept 04 | |
| Four strategic goals – 2002 (p 11) | | 7June 04 p 47/March 04 p 50/Dec 03 p | |
| Continually improve and refine | | 55/Sept 03 p 39/June 03 p 53/March 03 | |
| business processes | | p 28/Dec 02 p 26/Sept 02 p 17/June 02 | |
| 2. Broaden revenue base & reduce costs | | p 23/March 02 p 20/Dec 01 p 23/Sept | |
| 3. Promote & assist planning regional | | 01 p 14) | |
| transportation centers | | Ridership & Farebox Revenues | |
| 4. Re-define who we are | | Ridership by month (Sept 05 p | |
| 5+5+5 Business Plan (p 11) | | 82/March 05 p 59/Dec 04 p 74/Sept 04 | |
| 1. Reduce costs 5% | | p 71/June 04 p 49/March 04 p 52/Dec | |
| 2.5% new revenues from retail, marketing | | 03 p 57/Sept 2003 p 40/June 03 p 54/ | |
| & advertising | | March 03 p 29/Dec 02 p 27/Sept 02 p | |
| 3. Cap ferry fare increases at 5% | | 18/June 02 p 24/March 02 p 22/Dec 01 | |
| 4. Recover 90% of operating costs by | | p 24/Sept 01 p 15) | |
| 2008 with revenues generated by the | | Farebox revenues by month (Sept 05 p | |
| ferry system | | 82/March 05 p 59/Dec 04 p 74/Sept 04 | |
| Customer Survey 2002 | | p 71/June 04 p 49/March 04 p 52/Dec | |
| 75% extremely satisfied or satisfied | | 03 p 57/Sept 2003 p 40/June 03 p 54/ | |

| | 2. Woving People and Goods P | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| | | March 03 p 29/Dec 02 p 27/Sept 02 p | |
| | | 18/June 02 p 24/March 02 p 22/Dec 01 | |
| | | p 2Sept 01 p 15) | |
| | | WSF annual farebox recovery rates | |
| | | (Dec 04 p 74/Dec 03 p 57) | |
| | | WSF farebox recovery – passenger | |
| | | only ferries (March 02 p 21) | |
| | | WSF farebox recovery – auto ferries | |
| | | (March 02 p 21) | |
| | | Vehicle ferry fare comparisons (Dec 01 | |
| | | p 25) | |
| | | Ferry system comparisons (Sept 01 p | |
| | | 18) | |
| | | Ferry capital program | |
| | | Construction program expenditures | |
| | | (Sept 05 p 82/March 05 p 58/Dec 04 p | |
| | | 74/Sept 04 p 7/June 04 p 48/March 04 | |
| | | p 51/Dec 03 p 56/Sept 2003 p 40/June | |
| | | 03 p 54/ March 03 p 29/Dec 02 p | |
| | | 27/Sept 02 p 18/June 02 p 24/March 02 | |
| | | p 22/Dec 01 p 25) | |
| | | , | |
| | | Goods Predictably: Transit | |
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| Agency Council on Coordinated | RCW 47.01.012 | Gray Notebooks | Transit service |
| Transportation (ACCT) 2003-4 Report to | The state's public transit agencies shall | Benchmark Transit Efficiency: | # of one-way public transit passenger |
| the Legislature | achieve the median cost per vehicle | Demand response service: average | trips (FL) |
| Three critical areas: | revenue hour of peer transit agencies, | cost per total hour (March 03 p 33/ | # of one-way trips provided for |
| Identify & address barriers | adjusting for the regional cost-of-living | June 04 p 56) | transportation disadvantaged (FL) |
| Focus on results | | Average fixed route cost per total hour | Average cost per requested one-way |
| Increase advocacy | | (March 03 p 33/ June 04 p 56) | trip for transportation disadvantaged |
| ACCT Strategic Plan | | Fixed route cost per total hour for six | (FL) |
| Mission: Facilitate statewide approach to | | system (March 03 p 33) | % of bus service hours required to |
| coordinated transportation to increase | | Demand response service: average | meet transit needs targets in the |
| access to transportation particularly for | | boardings per revenue hour (March 03 | Transit Plan (MN) |
| special needs transportation customers | | p 34/ June 04 p 56) | Annual public transit ridership in rural |
| Goals: | | Average fixed route boarding per | areas (NM) |
| Efficiency-Increase the cost efficiency | | revenue hour (March 03 p 34/ June 04 | Annual welfare to work ridership in |
| of publicly funded transportation | | p 56) | rural areas (NM) |
| Effectiveness: Meet customer and | | Fixed route boardings per revenue hour | Disabled and elderly program |
| | A- | 125 | |

Goal 2: Moving People and Goods Predictably: Washington State Ferries

Benchmarks/Key Measures

Other Measures

| Goal 2: Moving People and Goods Predictably: Transit | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---|---|--|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures | |
| community transportation needs Coordination: The state investment in transportation will be coordinated with customers and communities Information: Providers and passengers will have the information they need to use the transportation system Accountability: Agencies and the public will understand the value of the state investment in coordinated transportation. Public Transportation & Intercity Rail Passenger Plan for WA State 1997-2016 (1996) Objectives for Public Transportation (except passenger rail) (pp 4-4-5) Preservation Preserve existing service levels Preserve existing facilities & equipment Education & Technical Support Implement state-of-the art transportation mgmt Promote use of public transportation Building Partnerships & Planning Build partnerships to improve planning & service delivery Address state policy in regional & local plans Facilitate the integration of public transportation in land use development process Improvement Promote develop of some form of public transportation in all areas of WA Integrate public transportation into a coordinated system | | for six systems (March 03 p 34) Average fixed route cost per passenger miles (March 03 p 34/ June 04 p 56) Fixed route cost per passenger mile for six system (March 03 p 34/ June 04 p 56) Demand response service average cost per boarding (March 03 p 35/ June 04 p 56) Vanpool service average cost per boarding (March 03 p 35/ June 04 p 56) Average fixed route cost per boarding (March 03 p 35/ June 04 p 56) Fixed route cost per boarding for six systems (March 03 p 35) | ridership (NM) Average # of public transit rides per disabled or elderly person annually (OR) Allocations of discretionary funds (i.e. above formula apportionment) for multimodal projects such as waterway, aviation and transit activities (MO) Number of total one-way unlinked transit trips taken by passengers on public transit vehicles (MO) Reviewing published transit service schedules in each rural county and averaging those daily frequencies within a week's schedule for available countywide transit service calculates the statewide average days per week that rural transit service is available. (MO) # of active transit vehicles in passenger service. (MO) # of inter-city bus stops available each year. (MO) varial public & specialized transportation options. (MO) rural public & specialized transportation mileage (KY) rural public transportation ridership statewide (KY) specialized public transportation # of passenger (KY) Human service transportation delivery customer satisfaction by 3% of June 30, 2004 (KY) Average # of HST monthly trips per year (KY) | |

| Goal 2: Moving People and Goods Predictably: Transit | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|----------------|------------------------|--|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures | |
| Improve mobility in small urban | | | | |
| and rural areas | | | | |
| Meet ADA requirements | | | | |
| Improve & develop urban public | | | | |
| transportation service including | | | | |
| as options HCT, HOV lanes and | | | | |
| TDM. | | | | |
| Washington Transportation Plan 2003- | | | | |
| 2022 | | | | |
| Meet the basic transportation needs for | | | | |
| special needs populations (p 1620 | | | | |

POG: TO IMPROVE STATEWIDE MOBILITY OF PEOPLE, GOODS, INFORMATION & ENERGY

| Goal 3: Effective Management of Transportation Assets and Public Resources: Preservation | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures | |
| Business Directions 2003-2007 | RCW 47.01.012 | Grey Notebooks | Highways: Pavement Conditions | |
| Goal: Plan and build (deliver) capital | No interstate highways, state routes, and | Highways: Pavement Conditions | Lane miles contracted for resurfacing | |
| investment projects for our transportation | local arterials shall be in poor condition | % of pavement in good condition, in | (FL) | |
| systems in accordance with the | Gray Notebook Sept 05 p 1 | poor condition, and lowest life cycle | # of commercial vehicle weightings | |
| instructions of the legislature. | Pavement conditions: % of | of poor pavement for rehabilitation | (FL) | |
| Preserve pavement to lowest life cycle | pavement in good or poor | each year, by pavement type (June | # of portable scale weights performed | |
| cost standards. | condition by type | 01 p. 14) | (FL) | |
| Preserve and maintain bridge | Bridge conditions: % of bridges in | Pavement condition trends: % of | % of commercial vehicles overweight | |
| structures and components to extend | good, fair or poor condition | pavement in good condition and in | (FL).% of SHA maintained roads with | |
| bridge service lives. | Ferry life cycle preservation: | poor condition, since 1973 (Dec 01, | acceptable ride quality (MD) | |
| Continue to address the preservation | Planned projects versus actual | p. 11; Dec 02, p. 17; Dec 03, p. 39; | % in good condition 4 year average | |
| backlog of ferry systems and | systems/structures preserved, | Dec 04, p. 50) | (NM) | |
| structures that are past due as well as | changed in cost rating | Pavement rehabilitation needs: lane | Complete reconstruction of 60% of | |
| ongoing deterioration of terminal and | | miles completed and not addressed | interstate lane miles and sustain a | |
| vessel components. | | (Dec. 01, p. 11; Dec 02, p. 16) | preventive pavement maintenance | |
| Washington State Transportation Plan | | \$ programmed for rehabilitation, and | program on 5% of all appropriate lane | |
| 2003-2027 | | %, by pavement type (Dec 03, p. 39; | miles per year (OH) | |
| System Preservation: Preserve | | Dec 04, p. 50) | Lane miles paved planned vs. actual | |
| transportation infrastructure to | | Roadway smoothness by centerline The facility and 10 in a second little and 10 in a second | (VA) | |
| achieve the lowest lifecycle cost (most | | mile (miles and % in poor condition), | Contracts planned vs. actual (VA) To product planned vs. actual (VA) To product planned vs. actual (VA) | |
| efficient maintenance cost) and | | reported to FHWA (Dec 01 p. 11; | To maintain minimal acceptable Ride Ovality Index limits (Internative 2.25) | |
| prevent failure. (p 162) | | Dec 02, p. 17; Dec 03, p. 41; Dec 04, | Quality Index limits (Interstates = 3.25, | |
| State Highway Plan (2003-2022) | | p. 53) | Parkways = 3.25, MP System = 3.00, | |
| Preservation (pp J-3 &4) | | Pavement trends (June 04 p 53) Highways Pridge Preservation | RS System = 2.75 | |
| Pavement: target the lowest life cycle cost per the Washington State | | Highways: Bridge PreservationRehab and replacement projects | Ride quality of pavementsRide quality of new construction | |
| Pavement Management System due | | scheduled in biennium, #, awards | and overlays (KY) | |
| date | | planned per quarter, estimated costs | Number of miles completed through | |
| Structures | | (Dec 01, p. 13; note: later years just | the Smooth Roads Initiative (MO | |
| o Bridge decks | | describe the current projects) | Highways: Bridge Preservation | |
| o Bridge decks o Bridge painting | | # deck protection projects, actual vs. | # of bridge inspections (FL) | |
| o Bridge replacement – reduce the | | planned (Dec 01, p. 13; Sept 03, p. | # of bridges inspections (FL) # of bridges contracted for repair (FL) | |
| # of functionally obsolete and | | 31) | # of bridges contracted for | |
| structurally deficient bridges | | # steel bridge painting projects, actual | replacement (FL) | |
| Misc structures – replace through | | vs. planned (Dec 01, p. 13; Dec 02, p. | % of SHA and MdTA NHS bridges | |
| state's inspection process | | 14; Sept 03, p. 31) | meeting federal structural standards | |
| o Moveable bridges – install reliable | | Preservation program results, planned | (MD) | |
| 3 Movedane anages mistan reliable | <u> </u> | 120 | (1112) | |

| Goal 3: Effective Management of Transportation Assets and Public Resources: Preservation | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| modern system | | vs. actual #s and % of goal met (Sept 03, p. 29; note: later years just describe the current projects) • # structurally deficient/functionally obsolete bridges, compared to national (Dec. 02, p. 14) • % bridges by structural condition rating – good-fair-poor (Sept 03, p. 29; Sept 04, p. 37; Sept 05, p. 51) Ferry Preservation • Category One terminal and vessel systems preserved, planned and revised planned vs. actual (Dec 03, p. 56; March 04, p. 52; June 04, p. 48; Sept 04, p. 72; Dec 04, p. 75; March 05, p. 57; Sept 05, p. 81) • Category Two terminal and vessel systems preserved, planned and revised planned vs. actual (Dec 03, p. 56; March 04, p. 52; June 04, p. 48; Sept 04, p. 72; Dec 04, p. 75; March 05, p. 57; Sept 05, p. 81) • # and age of ferries by class of vessel (March 04, p. 51) | % of bridge area on trunk highway over 20" meeting structural condition for good or poor (MN) To reduce the number of bridges with a sufficiency rating below 30 (KY) Percent of deficient bridges on major highways (MO) |
| | | ssets and Public Resources: Capita | |
| Plans/Goals Review of Accountability Mechanisms for WSDOT Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee Aug 2005 WSDOT moving from a program focused to project focused approach to managing and reporting the delivery of | Benchmarks/Key Measures Gray Notebook Sept. 05 Schedule, scope & budget summary of nickel and TPA projects: planned vs. actual results of scope, schedule and budget. Project delivery milestone reporting: | Other Measures Grey Notebooks Costs Annual and quarterly construction cost trend indexes, WSDOT compared to FHWA and Caltrans (Sept 05 p. 43) Quarterly unit bid price trends for four | States: Other Measures Construction Status Mincrease in # of days required for completed construction contracts over original contract days (less weather days) (FL) Mincrease in final amount paid for |

| Plans/Goals Plans/Goals Benchmark/Re/ Measures capital improvements and preservation Project Control and Reporting Guide: Managing Program Delivery at the Project Level April 2005 • WSDOT long standing commitment to deliver its projects within approved scopes, schedules & budgets • Consistency in project control and reporting within WSDOT (p. 3) • Principles for control & reporting (p. 6) • No surprises, early warming • Frequent, consistent, data drifven project and program performance o Increased independent access to information on WSDOT program and project management performance Business Directions 2003-07 (p. 2) • Plan for needed projects Support development of a Regional Transportation District program for central Pugel Sound Deliver capital projects provided by legislature • Develop better project management and reporting systems All mitiant IT legacy systems to ensure existing program delivery and reporting • Develop policies to monitor project status and financial reports through collaboration with regional administrators and headquarters staff. (p 4) 4) 10 Plan for ceded projects provided by legislature • Develop policies to monitor project status and financial reports through collaboration with regional administrators and headquarters staff. (p 4) 4) 10 Plan for needed projects provided by legislature • Develop policies to monitor project status and financial reports through collaboration with regional administrators and headquarters staff. (p 4) 10 Project swin faint delivery milestone dates against actual completion dates when project cash flow adjustments (June 03, p. 13) • Projects swin faint and the project span delivery or project and hot mix asphalt, actual price vs. coat • Cash flow on highway construction (Seglot 14, p. 34, sept 05, p. 3, 0) • Projects planed vs. actual and hot mix asphalt, actual price vs. coat • Cash flow on highway construction and the project and project and project and project and project span developed to a coat to a complete cash flow adjustmen | Goal 3: Effective | Management of Transportation As | ssets and Public Resources: Capita | al Project Delivery |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| capital improvements and preservation Project Control and Reporting Guide: Managing Program Delivery at the Project Level April 2005 WSDOT long standing commitment to deliver its projects within approved scopes, schedules & Budgets & Consistency in project control and reporting within WSDOT (p.3) Principles for control & reporting (p.6) No surprises, early warming on Frequent, consistent, data-driven project and project management performance in Increased independent access to information on WSDOT program and project management performance Business Directions 2003-07 (p. 2) Plan for needed projects Support development of a Regional Transportation District program for central Pugel Sound Deliver capital projects provided by legislature Develop better project management and reporting systems Develop better project management and reporting systems Develop better project management and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) 4) Develop policies to monitor project stands and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) 4) Develop policies to monitor project stands and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) An additional project stands and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) An additional project stands and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) An additional project stands and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) An additional project stands and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) An additional project stands and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) An additional project stands and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) An additional project stands and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) An additional project stands and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) An additional project stands and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) An additional project stands and machinistrators and project stands and machinistrators and headquarters staff. (p.4) An additional project stands and machinistrators and headqu | | | | |
| p. 32; Sept 05, p. 47) distinguishes between design and | Plans/Goals capital improvements and preservation Project Control and Reporting Guide: Managing Program Delivery at the Project Level April 2005 • WSDOT long standing commitment to deliver its projects within approved scopes, schedules & budgets • Consistency in project control and reporting within WSDOT(p 3) • Principles for control & reporting (p 6) No surprises, early warning Frequent, consistent, data-driven project and program performance reporting Increased independent access to information on WSDOT program and project management performance Business Directions 2003-07 (p. 2) Plan for needed projects Support development of a Regional Transportation District program for central Puget Sound Deliver capital projects provided by legislature Develop better project management and reporting systems Maintain IT legacy systems to ensure existing program delivery and reporting capabilities (p 3) Develop policies to monitor project status and financial reports through collaboration with regional administrators and headquarters staff. (p | Benchmarks/Key Measures compares planned delivery milestone dates against actual completion dates • Highway construction program advertisements: planned vs. actual # of projects advertised. • Cash flow on highway construction projects: planned vs. actual expenditures for preservation and improvement programs. • Individual contracts: final cost to award amount: % of final costs above or below award Review of Accountability Mechanisms for WSDOT Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee Aug 2005 Recommended key performance measure: % of capital projects for which standardized performance data (cost and | major construction materials: structural concrete, roadway excavation, steel reinforcing bar and hot mix asphalt, actual price vs. cost trend (Sept 04, p. 34; Sept 05 p. 46) Improvement program cash flow, pre- existing funds, planned vs. actual expenditures by quarter and by biennium (Dec. 01, p. 2; March 02, p. 2; June 02, p. 3; Sept 02, p. 3; Dec 02, p. 7; March 03, p. 3; June 03, p. 34; Sept 03, p. 23; Dec 03, p. 30; March 04, p. 25; June 04, p. 33; Sept. 04, p. 31; Dec. 04, p. 38; March 05, p. 34; Sept 05, p. 38; Dec 05, p. 41) Cash flow on transportation funding package construction (nickel funds), planned vs. actual expenditures (June 03, p. 34; Sept 03, p. 23; Dec 03, p. 30; March 04, p. 25; June 04, p. 30; Sept 04, p. 28; Dec 04, p. 34; March 05, p. 30) Highway project cash flow adjustments (June 03, p 10) Rail project cash flow adjustments (June 03, p 12) % award amount to engineer's estimate (June 02, p. 4; June 03, p. 36; June 04, p. 34) Contract cost value over/under, final to award (June 02, p. 5; June 03, p. 37; June 04, p. 35) Final cost to engineer's estimate (June 02, p. 5; June 03, p. 37; June 04, p. 36) Hot mix asphalt contracts awarded, tons projected and awarded (Sept 04, | States: Other Measures completed construction contracts over original contract amount (FL) • % of construction contracts planned for letting that were actually let (FL) • # of projects certified ready for construction (FL) • Projects with right-of-way support provided. (FL) • % projects completed by revised date (OH) • CE Rating # (OH) • % of projects finalized in less than 6 months (OH) • # projects not finalized within 6 months (OH) • The delivery of projects and services is streamlined: % of Mn/DOT projects in the first year of the State Transportation Improvement Program that are let for construction in the same planned year. (MN) • Projects are delivered on the schedule promised to the public, contractors and affected communities: % variation in major projects' costs from estimates when projects first enter the State Transportation Improvement Program to actual cost when let for construction. (MN) • Number of calendar days it takes to go from the programmed commitment on the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program to construction completion. (MO) • Measure: Data tracks time from inclusion in the TIP to completion and |

| Goal 3: Effective | Management of Transportation As | ssets and Public Resources: Capita | al Project Delivery |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | vs. actual (Sept 01, p. 5; March 02, p. 28; Sept 02, p. 3; March 03, p. 37; Sept 03, p. 23; March 04, p. 27; March 05, p. 36; Sept 05, p. 47) • Project progress, pre-existing funds projects: # projects advertised, # delayed, # deleted by quarter and biennium (Sept 02, p. 4; Sept 03, p. 22; Dec 03, p. 29; March 04, p. 22; June 04, p. 31; Sept 04, p. 29; Dec 04, p. 35; March 05, pp. 31-33; Sept 05, p. 39) • Program delivery, pre-existing funds projects: # construction program advertisements, planned vs. actual, by quarter (June 01, pp. 2-4; Sept 01, p. 5; Dec. 01, p. 2; March 02, p. 2; June 02, p. 3; Sept 02, p. 3; Dec 02, p. 7; March 03, p. 3; June 03, p. 33; Sept 03, p. 21; Dec 03, p. 29; March 04, p. 22; June 04, pp. 30-31; Sept 04, p. 29; Dec 04, p. 35; March 05, p. 31) • Program delivery, nickel funds projects: # construction program advertisements, planned vs. actual, by quarter (June 03, p. 33; Sept 03, p. 21; Dec 03, p. 29; March 04, p. 22; June 04, p. 30; Sept 04, p. 28; Dec 04, p. 34; March 05, p. 30) • Project evaluations, 1 to 4 stars for on-time, on-budget performance (Dec 03, p. 32; Dec 04, p. 40) • Value of advertised and deferred projects by subprogram (Dec. 01, p. 2; March 02, p. 2) • # projects shifted between subprograms (Dec. 01, p. 2; March 02, p. 2) | • Percent of customers that feel completed projects are the right transportation solutions. (MO) • Measure: Statewide telephone survey. (MO) • Percent of project timeliness as compared to other state DOTs. Construction Quality • Construction Quality Compliance (VA) Ratings reflect compliance with contract requirements set forth under the Construction Quality Compliance Program designed to • Assess project quality as measured by compliance with contract requirements • Promote cooperative efforts between VDOT and contractor staff • Provide opportunities for on the job training, problem resolution and sharing of best practices • Apprise project operations • Support tactical and strategic planning decisions |
| | | Project delivery summary reports for | |

| Goal 3: Effective | Management of Transportation As | ssets and Public Resources: Capita | l Project Delivery |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| | | nickel projects (Sept 05, p 5) | |
| | | Schedule, scope and budget | |
| | | summary of nickel projects (Sept 05, p | |
| | | 6) | |
| | | 2003 Transportation Funding Package | |
| | | Proposed adjustments to project | |
| | | delivery (Sept 05, p 16) | |
| | | Highway projects: proposed | |
| | | adjustments to project delivery (Sept | |
| | | 03, p 7-8; Dec 03 p 16; March 05, p | |
| | | 15; Sept 04 p 12; June 04, p 12) | |
| | | Rail projects: proposed adjustments to | |
| | | project delivery (Sept 03, p 8; Dec 03 | |
| | | p 17 June 04, p 13) | |
| | | Ferry projects; proposed adjustments | |
| | | to project delivery (Mach 05, p 15; | |
| | | June 04, p 12) | |
| | | Construction Program Delivery | |
| | | Hot mix asphalt contracts awarded, | |
| | | tons projected and awarded (Sept 04, | |
| | | p. 32; Sept 05, p. 47) | |
| | | Hot mix asphalt pavement projected | |
| | | vs. actual (Sept 01, p. 5; March 02, p. | |
| | | 28; Sept 02, p. 3; March 03, p. 37; | |
| | | Sept 03, p. 23; March 04, p. 27; | |
| | | March 05, p. 36; Sept 05, p. 47) | |
| | | Project progress, pre-existing funds | |
| | | | |
| | | projects: # projects advertised, # | |
| | | delayed, # deleted by quarter and | |
| | | biennium (Sept 02, p. 4; Sept 03, p. | |
| | | 22; Dec 03, p. 29; March 04, p. 22; | |
| | | June 04, p. 31; Sept 04, p. 29; Dec | |
| | | 04, p. 35; March 05, pp. 31-33; Sept | |
| | | 05, p. 39) | |
| | | Program delivery, pre-existing funds | |
| | | projects: # construction program | |
| | | advertisements, planned vs. actual, by | |
| | | quarter (June 01, pp. 2-4; Sept 01, p. | |
| | | 5; Dec. 01, p. 2; March 02, p. 2; June | |

| Goal 3: Effective | Management of Transportation As | sets and Public Resources: Capita | al Project Delivery |
|--|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| | | actual (Dec 01, p. 25; June 02, p. 24; Sept 02, p. 18; Dec 02, p. 27; March 03, p. 29; June 03, p. 54; Sept 03, p. 40; Dec 03, p. 56; March 04, p. 51; June 04, p. 48; Sept 04, p. 71; Dec 04, p. 75; March 05, p. 58; Sept. 05, p. 82) Terminal construction: \$ over-/under-spent (March 05, p. 58; Sept 05, p. 81) Vessel construction: \$ over-/under-spent (March 05, p. 58; Sept 05, p. 81) | |
| Goal 3: Effective | e Management of Transportatio | n Assets and Public Resources: | Environmental |
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| Business Directions 2003-7 Develop & implement context sensitive solutions training to improve coordination and partnership opportunities with local agencies(p 5) Complete the development of the Environmental Management System (EMS). Environmental Policy Statement 2001 (www.wsdot.wa.gov) Principles: To implement and maintain an environmental management system that embraces all program functions; To establish, maintain and make available to the public appropriate performance indicators of the Department's exercise of its environmental stewardship and to consistently review these indicators as a basis to improve the Department's | | Grey Notebooks Fish Passage # fish passage barriers identified, vs. goal (Dec 01, p. 19; March 05, p. 48) # miles state highway system inventoried for fish barriers (Dec. 01, p. 20; March 05, p. 48) % barriers corrected/ need to correct (Dec. 01, p. 19; March 05, p. 48) Construction Runoff Downstream water quality monitoring results: # in/out of compliance (Dec 01, p. 21; June 02, p. 21; March 03, p. 20; Dec 04, p. 64) # samples in/out of compliance with state water clarity standards (Dec 04, p. 64) Replacement Wetlands # replacement projects (March 02, p. 14; March 03, p. 21; Dec 03, p. 47; ; Dec 04, p. 66) | Fish Passage Fish passage at State culverts - # of river miles of habitat opened up for fish passage as a result of culvert retrofits and replacements (OR) Water Quality Required water quality permits with inspection violations continues to decrease. (MN) Maintain and improve water quality by meeting applicable water quality standards: Compliance with applicable water quality standards, including the Chesapeake Bay 2000 Agreement(VA) Air Quality Outdoor levels of ozone, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide and particulate matter as of \$ of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. (MN) |
| a basis to improve the Department's performance;To comply with all environmental laws | | Total acreage of wetland projects (March 02, p. 14; March 03, p. 21; ; | Estimated carbon dioxide emissions from motor vehicles in MN (MN) |

| Goal 3: Effective | ve Management of Transportatio | n Assets and Public Resources: | Environmental |
|--|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| Plans/Goals and regulations applicable to our business and activities; To assure that employees of the Department receive training; To communicate to contractors, designers, consultants and other participants in the Department's work the management practices and compliance requirements established to further the aims of this Policy Statement; To encourage employees and all other citizens to communicate with the Department about ways to increase the effectiveness of Department's practices supporting its mission of environmental stewardship; To make every reasonable effort to also protect the cultural and historic resources of the state. WSDOT Executive Order on Context Sensitive Solutions A proposed transportation project must be planned not only for its | | Other Measures Dec 04, p. 66) Monitoring complete: # sites and acres successful/ not completely successful (March 02, p. 15; March 03, p. 22; Dec 03, p. 47; ; Dec 04, p. 66) Monitoring ongoing: # sites and acres meeting standards, meeting some standards, meeting no standards (March 02, p. 15; March 03, p. 21; Dec 03, p. 47; ; Dec 04, p. 66) Erosion Control Assessment results, by % in categories excellent, good, fair, poor (Dec 03, p. 49; Dec 04, p. 65) Stormwater Treatment Pollutant removal before/after treatment (Dec 04, p. 63;) Environmental Compliance # Non-compliance events/yr, for fish/wetlands/water (March 03, p. 17; Dec 03, p. 46; ; Dec 04, p. 68) Water quality non-compliance events for ferries and roadways (March 03, p. | States: Other Measures Maintain and improve air quality by meeting applicable air quality standards: Projects in conformity reduction in pollutants (VA) Transportation-related emissions by region (MD) Percent of air quality days that meet Environmental Protection Agency standards by metropolitan area. Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet EPA's ground level ozone standard.(MO) Permitting Measure: Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet EPA's ground level ozone standard.(MO) Permitting Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet EPA's ground level ozone standard.(MO) Permitting Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet EPA's ground level ozone standard.(MO) Permitting Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet EPA's ground level ozone standard.(MO) Permitting Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet EPA's ground level ozone standard.(MO) Permitting Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet EPA's ground level ozone standard.(MO) Permitting Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet EPA's ground level ozone standard.(MO) Permitting Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet EPA's ground level ozone standard.(MO) Permitting Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet EPA's ground level ozone standard.(MO) Permitting Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet EPA's ground level ozone standard.(MO) Permitting Measure: Percentage of days in Kansas City and St. Louis that meet Environmental Assessment, Environmental Assessment, Environmental Assessment Worksheet per project. (MN) Environmental impact study: Reduce |
| physical aspects as a facility serving specific transportation objectives, but also for its effects on the aesthetic, social, economic and environmental values, needs, constraints and opportunities in a larger community setting. Transportation Permit Efficiency and Accountability Committee (TPEAC) Goals Reduce the cost of environmental mitigation Increase environmental benefit Reduce the redesign of transportation | | 17) Integrated vegetation management non-compliance events and # product applications (March 03, p. 17; Dec 03, p. 46; ; Dec 04, p. 68) Permit tracking: agency, date issued, expires, X permit to be used (March 04, p. 39; March 05, p. 47) EIS Tracking # NEPA EISs completed/in development (March 03, p. 19; June 03, p. 19; March 04, p. 38) EIS concurrence requests, % non-concurrence, waive, concurrence, | the amount of time taken to complete an Environmental Impact Study to 36 months (KY) Environmental assessment: Reduce the amount of time taken to complete an Environmental Assessment to 12 months (KY) Environmental tracking system: Implement an environmental document tracking (KY) Percent of projects completed without environmental violation.(MO) Measure: LOWs and NOVs (written correspondence from regulatory |

| Goal 3: Effective | e Management of Transportatio | n Assets and Public Resources: | Environmental |
|---|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| Plans/Goals projects Reduce the time required to obtain permits Increase the number of project permits that receive programmatic approval Washington State Transportation Plan 2003-2027 Stewardship of the Environment Maintain air quality Meet water quality standards Maintain habitat & watershed quality & connectivity Reuse & recycle resource materials | Benchmarks/key Measures | concurrence a/Advisory (March 04, p. 38;) ESA Compliance ESA process tracking (June 03, p. 21; Sept 03, p. 17; Dec 03, pp. 15, 24; March 04, p. 38; Dec 04, p. 26) # projects in compliance (June 04, p. 21; Sept 04, p. 21; Dec 04, pp. 26-27; March 05, pp. 23-24; Sept 05, p. 31) | agencies) by project. (MO) Wetlands The ratio of wetland acres replaced to acres of wetlands affected meets federal and state requirements. (MN) Ratio of acres replaced by Mn/DOT to acres of wetlands affected. (MN) Wetlands are replaced with planned wetland types.% of replaced wetland types are as planned (MN) Wetland creation projects by NMDOT (NM) Wetland creation projects by NMDOT (NM) # of acreage banked (KY) average wetland loss/average wetland mitigation ration/# of bank sites used (KY) Ratio of acres of wetlands created compared to the number of acres of wetland impacted. Measure: Acres of impact taken from Clean Water Act permits, listed by project. Acres of wetland construction taken form roadway design maps or mapped wetland areas restored by MoDOT, listed by project. (MO) Land Management Mn/DOT manages it land with native plant species in order to reduce the need for mowing and pesticides.# of acres replanted with native species. (MN) Conversion of undeveloped land # of undeveloped acres converted to another land use. (MN) Maintain habitat and watershed quality and connectivity: Improvement in habitat or watershed condition (VA) |

| Goal 3: Effective | ve Management of Transportation | on Assets and Public Resources | : Environmental |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| | <u> </u> | | Cultural & Historic Resources |
| | | | Preserve Virginia's rich cultural and |
| | | | historic resources: # of resources |
| | | | protected and/or enhanced (VA) |
| | | | Number of historic resources avoided |
| | | | or protected as compared to those |
| | | | mitigated: Measure: Number of |
| | | | historic resources in the project |
| | | | footprint and the number of times |
| | | | MoDOT successfully consults with the |
| | | | historic district to make changes to |
| | | | plans to avoid or protect those |
| | | | resources vs. the number of |
| | | | resources for which MoDOT has to |
| | | | mitigate. |
| | | | Community Planning |
| | | | Ensure that transportation facilities |
| | | | and services are compatible with the |
| | | | communities and destinations they |
| | | | serve: Consistency with community |
| | | | and/or destination (VA) |
| | | | Context sensitive solutions: Establish |
| | | | a system to document best practices |
| | | | of context sensitive solutions (KY) |
| | | | Crash rate comparison: Establish a custom to compare greek rates of |
| | | | system to compare crash rates of context sensitive solution projects to |
| | | | comparable non-context sensitive |
| | | | solution projects (KY) |
| | | | Wildlife |
| | | | Protected wildlife crossings created |
| | | | (NM) |
| | | | Number of projects on which MoDOT |
| | | | protects or restores sensitive species |
| | | | or habitat. Measure: Projects in the |
| | | | vicinity of threatened or endangered |
| | | | species or critical habitat involving US |
| | | | Fish and Wildlife Service review. (MO |

| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
|-------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|
| | | | Department Management Performance of projects in meeting environmental goals (NM) Compost use by NMDOT Compost stocks installed by NMDO Compost berms installed by NMDOT Discard tires reused by NMDOT Percent of alternative fuel consumed Use of E-85 and biodiesel fuels by MoDOT vehicles and equipment as percent of total fuel usage. (MO) Number of trees planted compared number of acres cleared. Measure: MoDOT has committed to plant 2 trees for each 6" or larger tree removed by construction operations Measure will compare trees planted trees removed. (MO) Number of tons of recycled/waste materials used in construction projects: Measure: Number of tons recycled/waste material used in construction projects. (MO) % of Mn/DOT fuel consumption defined as cleaner fuels (MN) |

| Goal 3: Effec | ctive Management of Transporta | tion Assets and Public Resource | es: Workforce |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Plans/Goals | Benchmarks/Key Measures | Other Measures | States: Other Measures |
| Plans/Goals Business Directions 2003-7 Goal: Report to the Transportation Commission, citizens, other officials and the legislature on achievements, shortcomings and challenges in WSDOT's performance. (p 6) Continue and expand efforts at internal communication to reinforce all employees' understanding of the agency mission and their roles. Sharpen and unify messages as part of the "OneDOT" communications strategy. Goal: Support the State Transportation Commission in preparing proposed budgets and plans for transportation systems and facilities. (pp 7-8) Ensure that employees are adequately trained in health and safety issues. Develop a successful Work Zone | | Gray Notebooks: Workforce levels: # of permanent full-time employees (June 02 p 2; Sept 02 p 2; Dec 02 p 6; March 03 p 2; June 03 p 32; Sept 03 p 20; Dec 03 p 28; Sept 04 p 27; June 04 p 29; March 04 p 21; Dec 04 p 33; March 05 p 29; Sept 05 p 37) Training Maintenance & safety training required by law (June 02 p 2; Sept 02 p 2; Dec 02 p 6; March 03 p 2; June 03 p 32; Sept 03 p 20; Dec 03 p 28; March 04 p 21; Dec 04 p 33; March 05 p 29; Sept 05 p 37) Training for all employees (June 02 p 2; Dec 02 p 6; March 03 p 2; June 03 p 32; Sept 03 p 20; Dec 03 p 28; Sept 04 p 27; June 04 p 29; March 04 p 21; Dec 04 p 33; March 05 p 29; Sept 05 p 37) | States: Other Measures Leadership Score on leadership system questions from employee survey (FL) Score on credibility questions on employee survey (FL) Workforce Development Satisfaction with employee pay (FL) Satisfaction with employee recognition (FL) Satisfaction with employee involvement (FL) Overall employee satisfaction (FL) Average rating on employee survey (KY) Workforce Development Satisfaction with employee pay (FL) Satisfaction with employee recognition (FL) Satisfaction with employee involvement (FL) Performance evaluations completed on-time (OH) EEO adverse impact area improvement (OH) |
| Develop a successful Work Zone Safety Task Force with an improved scope and operations plan that addresses work zone design and implementation with the construction program. Fill key vacancies and continue attention to placement and recruitment of the best available management talent at every organizational level. Retool and implement WSDOT's leadership development program to prepare for manager succession. | | p 37) Worker Safety Highway Maintenance Workers: Recordable injuries per 100 workers per calendar year (June 01 p 1; Sept 01 p 1; Dec 01 p 1; March 02 p 1; June 02 p 1; June 02 p 1; June 02 p 1; June 03 p 31; Sept 03 p 19; Dec 03 p 27; March 04 p 19; June 04 p 27; Sept 04 p 25; Dec 04 p 31; March 05 p 27; Sept 05 p 35) Highway Engineering Workers: Recordable injuries per 100 workers per calendar year (June 01 p 1; Sept 01 p 1; Dec 01 p 1; March 02 p 1; June 02 p 1; June 03 p 31; Sept 03 p 19; Dec 03 p 27; March 04 p 19; June | improvement (OH) Internal Communications Average score on communications items (FL) Employee Suggestions \$ saved from employee suggestion (KY) Recruitment & Retention Absenteeism measure: sick leave used/approved leave without pay used/unapproved leave without pay used (KY) Employee turnover rate: # of separations (KY) % of employees who leave MoDOT annually compared to similar-sized, like organizations (MO) # NMDOT Vacancies (NM) |

| Goal 3: Effective Management of Transporta | ation Assets and Public Resources: Workforce |
|--|--|
| | 04 p 27; Sept 04 p 25;Dec 04 p 31; March 05 p 27;Sept 05 p 35) Ferry Vessel Workers: Recordable injuries per 100 workers per calendar year (June 01 p 1; Sept 01 p 1; Dec 01 p 1; March 02 p 1; June 02 p 1; Sept 02 p 1;Dec 02 p 5; March 02 p 1;June 03 p 31; Sept 03 p 19; Dec 03 p 27; March 04 p 19; June 04 p 27; Sept 04 p 25;Dec 04 p 31; March 05 p 27; Sept 05 p 35) # of work injures by type (Sept 05 p 35) Recordable injuries & illnesses (March 01 p 1) Recordable injuries & illnesses (March 01 p 1) # MMDOT Separations (NM) Worker Safety OSHA recordable injuries and lost workdays (KY) GAB (worker's compensation) billing (KY) First report of injury or illness claim (KY) Number of days lost due to work related injuries (MO) Workers Compensation Loss Experience (NM) Fleet Motor Vehicle Accidents (NM) Workforce Level Average regular hours and average overtime hours worked by employees (does not include seasonal or wage employees). Annual leave and sick leave are held constant.(MO) Train and equip an increasingly productive work force that does not exceed 6,031 full time employees. (OH) Training Training scheduled and attended (OH) |